



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

CLAIMS
OF THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND
ON
NATIONAL SUPPORT.

BY THE
REV. J. SIMPSON, M. A.







600101796U

CLAIMS
OF THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND
ON
NATIONAL SUPPORT.

BY THE
REV. JOSEPH SIMPSON, M.A.,
VICAR OF TILSWORTH, BEDFORDSHIRE.



—"per eam Rex et regnum solidum
Subsistendi habent fundamentum."
Leges. Eccl. St. Edw. Regis et Confess.

LONDON:
JOHN H. BATTY, 2, BEDFORD STREET, STRAND.

1874.

110. m. 402.

PREFACE.

THE object of this Work is to confirm the minds of those whose opinions on the subject of the union of the Church with the State have been shaken, or have been hitherto unsettled, through the attempts, on the part of the State, to reduce the Church to a condition little better than that of subjection to the Civil Power. It is the endeavour of the Author to shew that such attempts have constantly been made, either by calling in the aid of a foreign power, or by the rough arm of the law, without previous consultation with the recognised voice of the Church. If, from the Canons of the Church and the words of Holy Scripture, it can be shown that the mind of the Church herself has never been contrary to such an union, as at present exists, in theory at least, in this country, and Churchmen can be convinced that, until the attitude of the State becomes such that separation is the only way of being free to execute her mission, union is desirable, the Author will feel that something will be gained by members of the Church of England being content to make the best use of the union that lies in their power. The danger at present is, lest some of those who are the most devoted and zealous of her sons, should think that the constant danger of the Church, becoming paralyzed by the action of the two Houses of Parliament, is in itself proof that the Civil and Spiritual Powers ought never to be in union. Those who reverence the wisdom, and thank God for the constancy of our forerunners in the Faith, will,

without doubt, take fresh courage, when they see that the Church has ever held the same opinion respecting that union, and in spite of the apparent disadvantages to which that union sometimes exposes it, yet that God has brought it safely through the various dangers which threatened it. We, of course, do not know what may be in store for us, but, in the meantime, while we bear in mind that the Church is Christ's Kingdom *in* the world, and resolve that none of its laws shall be altered at the bidding of the kingdoms *of* the world, we must be encouraged to work His work by the thought that He has never, either by His Sacred Canon of Scripture, or by the Holy Canons of His Church, forbidden the children of His Kingdom to accept of assistance from those into whose hand He has committed the power of the "sword."

If, by reading these pages, any member of the Church of England is encouraged to persevere in working and praying for its welfare, and becomes convinced that, while working in alliance with the State, he is doing his Master's work in his Master's way, the Author will receive that satisfaction which arises from the feeling that his work will not have been in vain.

Tilsworth, Beds., August 17th, 1874.

INDEX.

	PAGE		PAGE
Able Ministry	22	Beaconceld, Grants at	94
Act for uniting churches	24	Bishops, sale of land belonging	
Advantages of Union between		to, in 1646	22
Church and State	122	— Objection to election of, to	
African Code	40, 70	be examined	71
Alberic	111	— sat in temporal court	94
Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria	119	— Abolition of, from House	
Amphilochius, Bishop of Iconium	119	of Lords	131
Alfred's and Guthrum's Law Ec.		Berghamsted, assembly at	95
Tithe and Rome Fee and Light		Boniface, Archbishop, Constitu-	
Scot, &c., to be paid	100	tions, A.D. 1261	118
Alfred, King, Laws of	100	Boniface, Bishop of Rome, decrees	70
Anselm, Canons of	109	Bothwell, Earl of	32
Ancyra, Synod at	65	Burial of Dissenters	8
Anastasius Bishop of Rome, de-		Burnet, quotation from	117
creed of	74		
Antioch, Council at	39, 40, 67	Calcuith	102
Apostolical Canons	39, 63	Calvin	18
Anglo Saxon Chronicle	93, 99	— Institutes, Book 4, c. 10,	
Apostacy, Church suffered	90	s. 30	128
Arelat Council, A.D. 314	74	Camden	13, 32, 127
Arian Controversy	66	Canterbury, metropolitical power	
Ariminum Synod	119	of, distasteful to Kings of Mercia	91
Arnold, Dr.	84	Canons, evidence derived from ...	118
Article 37th	54	— from the Roman Church ...	113
Athanasius	68, 69, 119	Canute, laws of	104
— his Works	119	Cealchythe, Canons Legatine at,	
Augustine, Archbishop of Can-		A.D. 785	98
terbury, landing	80	— Bishops forbidden to judge	
— Gregory, Answers to	40	in secular matters by Canon 10	98
Aurelius	87	Celerinus	87
Augustine Bishop of Hippo, on		Celibacy of clergy	110
Toleration	20	Chad, completion of his consecra-	
Aurelian, conduct of, in case of		tion	41
Paul of Samosata	64	Chalcedon, Council of 72, 74, 79, 119,	
Auxentius, Arian Bishop of Milan		and 133	
— Death	45	Chalice and Patten made of wood	103
		Charles I., Answer 8th of	15
Baptism, refusal of Bishops to		Civil power, Scriptural proofs in	
Communicate unbaptized per-		favour of and obedience to ...	5, 6
sons	81	Church and State	104
Baxter, Richard, opinion of tolera-		— Causes concerning the	
tion	17	Church to have preference in	
— On the evils of schism 32, 127		civil courts... ..	19, 106
Bede, indirect testimony to succe-		— union of, not displeasing	
sion	43	to God, Scriptural proofs 58, 122	

	PAGE		PAGE
Church and State, separation of	19	Easter, Oswy's Queen came from	
Civil Magistrate, power of, defined		Kent and observed it at a dif-	
in 37 Article	54	ferent time	82
Conscience, plea of	7, 18, 19	Elementary Education Act	9
Chrysostom, John, election of	45	Ecgbright, Archbishop of York	96
Church Rates, antiquity of	10	— Answers of	97
— Abolition Act	9	Edgar King, laws of	105
— Neglect of tenants in		Edmund, Archbishop, refusal to	
country places to support the		consecrate Richard Wendover	
Church since the Act	9, 50	to the See of Rochester	113
Clarendon, Articles of, tendency		— His journey to Rome	113
of, to oppress the Church by		— Canon 16 on confession	113
Art. 12. Henry II, by his con-		Edward the Confessor's laws	105
duct increased the papal in-		Edward I.	114
fluence	112	Eikon Basilike	15, 32
Claude de Saumaise His. Ang.	64	Elfric's Canons	102
Cloveshoo, Synod at. Bishops to		Elizabeth Queen, Injunction, A.D.	
inform their clergy of the in-		1559	55
junctions at Synods	97	Emperor petitioned where the	
Common Prayer prohibited	15	State had control	71
Commons, House of	3, 11, 15	— Position of, towards the	
Corboyl, Archbishop, Canons of	110	Church, laid down in Justinian,	
Constantine the Great did not		Nov. 16	62
seat himself at the Council till		Ephesus, Council at	119
he had permission of the bishops	67	Episcopal authority sometimes	
Constantine Pogonatus	76	delegated to Commissioners	71
County Court, King's priest in	100	Endowments	124
Constantinople, Council at, A.D.		Eolla Bishop of South Saxons, not	
381	69, 72, 119	succeeded	96
— Council, A.D. 680	76	Ethelbald	97
Cromwell, Vicar Gen.	116	Ethelbert King, Dooms Eccles.	81
Convocation and Parliament, con-		Ethelred re-ired to Normandy	104
nection between, little under-		— Laws Eccles.	104
stood	27	Ethelstan. Bishops ought to be	
— Position of	51	present with secular judges in	
Cyprian, no proof from, in support		their judicature	101
of laymen being admitted into		Ethelwulf, grant to the Church	99
Church Synods	84	Eusebius, Bishop of Vercelli	119
Dioscorus deposed	45	Eusebius. List of succession of	
Disestablishment	18, 34	bishops in his works	38, 118
— Opinion of Dissenters		— Riots at election of	44
that clergy are paid by the		Eustathius, Bishop of Bercea,	
State considered	46	translated to Antioch	132
— Undue action on the		Fathers, testimony of, valuable	42, 43
part of either Church or State		Faith, the Church of England has	
no argument for	91	retained it through the use of	
Dissenters, union with	33, 35	the three Creeds	53
Diocese, division of, a subject for		Four First General Councils	121
settlement at a Synod	95	French Protestants settled in Eng-	
Divisions or schisms	127	land	12
Dugdale	15, 16, 23, 32	— Queen Elizabeth's opinion	
Edmund King, Laws Eccles.	102	respecting them	13
Eanham, Council at, Canon 9.		— Act of Parliament passed	
Patrons had no right to turn		against	13
priests out	103	— Relaxation of laws by	
Easter observed in Northumber-		King James	14
land with the Isle of Columkill	82	— The result of relaxation	14

INDEX.

vii.

	PAGE		PAGE
Gangra, Council of	67	Ibas	93
Gooiwin	113	Influence of Rome	113, 115
Godliness, appearance of, assumed to effect political ends	31	Investitures	110
Gospel—conciliation of its oppo- nents not enjoined by its pre- cepts	18	John de Cremona	110
Greatlea, Council at	101	Illiberis Council	73
Gregory's, Pope, answer	40, 80	James I., relaxation of laws by	14
Gregory Nazianzum	45	—— Opinion of Presbytery	16
Grievances of Dissenters	8	—— Opinion of the Oath of Supremacy	56
Grindall, Bishop	12	—— His works	56
—— Encouragement of Half- Conformists	16	Ine, King of the West Saxons— laws	93
Hadrian	89	—— Bishops sat in the Tem- poral Court	94
Hales on uneducated ministry	23	Ingulph	99, 100
Hampton Court Conference	14	Interpretation of Sacred Scripture	42
Harding	127	John the Archchanter	93
Hatfield, Council at	93	Julian the Apostate	21
Heathen Temples, destruction of	71	Julius, Bishop of Rome	78
Head of the Church of England, King acknowledged, as by Con- vocation in 1531	116	Justinian's Novels on Patronage —— on Position of the Em- peror	47 62
Hedda Bishop of West Saxons, proceedings after death of	95	Justus, departure of	81
Heraclius, Emperor, attempt to unite Eutychians to the Church	75	Laity. Bishops chosen in presence of laity	27
Henry I. commanded Anselm to consecrate certain bishops, An- selm refused; then Gerard, Archbishop of York, was com- manded to consecrate; but Wil- liam of Winchester refused	110	—— Testimony of Cyprian	44
Henry II. sought Pope Adrian's support in the conquest of Ireland	109	—— On Introduction of them into Convocation	50, 77
—— by his conduct increased the Papal influence	112	—— When admitted to Councils	97
Henry III.'s grant for the Holy Land	115	—— Cyprian on this point	85, 110
Henry VIII., proceedings of, done under semblance of law	26	Lambeth, Archbishop Peckham, Constitutions at	114
—— suppressed the privileges of the Pope	115	Lanfranc's Canons	108
Hertford, Council at	83, 90	Langton Stephen, Constitutions of, partly from decrees of the Lateran Council, A.D. 1216	113
Hilary	119	Lampadius, Synod of	78
Hilda	83	Laodicea, Council at	69
Hinton, J. H., threat of, at Reading	22	Laurentius	81
—— The same verified	25	Lichfield raised to an Archiepis- copal See by Offa	98
Honorius, Bishop of Rome, admit- ted heretics into communion	75	London, Synod at, A.D. 1126	110
Horsley's Bishop, review of the case of Protestant Dissenters	21, 25, 29	Lucius Bishop of Rome, decreed that every bishop should be accompanied with two presby- ters and three deacons	78
Hosius Bishop of Cordova, mis- sion of to Alexandria	66	Magna Charta	114
		Mahomedanism gained ground most where heresy prevailed	76
		Marriage Law	8
		Malmsbury, William of	98, 110
		Martin I., Synod under	93
		Marcian Emperor, present at Council of Chalcedon, part he took	79

	PAGE		PAGE
Melitus and Justus, departure of for France—their recall ...	81	Royal Declaration before the 39 Articles ...	121
Milan, Disensions at ...	45	Ruffinus on the Church of Milan	45
Monophysites ...	75	Sabert, death of ...	81
Monothelites ...	75, 93	Sanctuary ...	96
Neo Cæsarea, Synod at ...	65	Sanders... ..	127
Nicæa, Council at ...	39, 66	Sanderson Bishop, on an unedu- cated ministry ...	24
Northumb., Presby., Leges... ..	102	Schism	127
Numidicus	87	Sardica, Synod of	69, 132
Oberlin, case of	49	Saxon Chronicle	93, 99
Odo, Canons of	101	Scotch race excluded from the ministry in the Province of Canterbury	99
— Canon 10, tythe not to exempt from almsgiving ...	102	Secular cause, when tried in the Church	71
Ordericus Vitalis	88	— If parties appeal to civil power no one present to be compelled to give evidence in the Temporal Court ...	108
Othobon, Legantine Constitutions of	114	Simplicius Bishop of Rome, de- crees	74
Otto, invited by Henry III. as legate a latere	113	Solemn League and Covenant ...	16
— Edmund, Archbishop, had to take subordinate place to Otto at the Synod of London	113	Sozomen	45, 66, 78, 132
Ordeal	101	Stephen King, sought confirma- tion of his title at Rome ...	109
Ordination of Bishops, care in ...	39	Subsidies demanded by King John but evaded	115
Oswy King	82, 84	— levied by force on clergy and laity, A.D. 1206... ..	115
Parker Archbishop, ordination of	44	— granted to Henry III. for the Holy Land... ..	115
Patronage, Question of, Justinian's Novels and Cons. of Toledo ...	47	— clergy assembled for the purpose by the Pope's bull ...	115
Paul of Samosata, case of	64	Submission, Act of	27
Paulinus, retirement to Rochester	90	Succession in the ministry, care of the Church in keeping up 35, 36, 38, 41, 43, 80, 99, 119	
Peckham Archbishop, Constitu- tions of	114	Suit between priests not to be com- menced before secular men ...	103
Peter St., of Alexandria, Canons of Political Contests, opinion—that the Clergy should not interfere in	57	Supremacy, Oath of	56
Platina	6	Statutes :—	
Præpositi	86	8 Henry VI., c. 1	51
Presbytery, King James I.'s opinion of... ..	16	25 Henry VIII., c. 19	27
— Dugdale's testimony con- cerning it	16	26 Henry VIII., c. 1	117
Primacy, settlement of, at Canter- bury	98	1 Elizabeth., c. 36	121
Private judgment	11	5 Elizabeth., c. 1	55
Public Worship Regulation Bill	72	17 Charles II., c. 3	24
Reading, Meeting at, in 1834	22, 25	6 & 7 William IV., c. 85 ...	8
Reform, under pretext of religion	31	31 & 32 Victoria, c. 109 ...	10
Registration of Dissenters	8	Tax on spiritualities, A.D. 1188 ...	115
Religious habit held in great veneration in Bede's time	89	Tests, objections to, discussed ...	29
Richard Archbishop, Canons of ...	113	Theodore	41, 89, 90, 91
Riots at election of bishops	44	Theodoret Bishop of Cyrus ...	119
Rogatianus	87	Theodotus Bishop of Ancyra ...	119
Rome Bishop of, authority of dis- regarded by Theodore	91	Theophilus Archbishop of Alex- andria, A.D. 385... ..	39, 70
— Synod at	93		

INDEX.

ix.

	PAGE		PAGE
Theodos Codex	74	Whitgift's Archbishop, opinion	
Tithes' Commutation Act	29	of Dissenters	16
Tithe, Rome fee	100	Whitby, meeting at	82
Toledo, Council of	47	Wighard	88
Toleration	17, 128	Wihtried, Church free from taxes	94
		and	95
Uneducated Ministry	23, 24	Wilfrid	83, 88
Unity	37, 126	—— dispute on subdivision of	
Universities, exclusion of Dissen-		his diocese... ..	90
ters from	8	William I. First mandate for sepa-	
Valentinian Emperor, opinion of,		rating the Ecclesiastical Court	108
as to jurisdiction in Church		—— secured the support of the	
matters	78	Pope when he invaded England	109
Voluntary system, want of inde-		Winchester, Council at, A.D. 855	99
pendence under, considered ...	47	—— other Councils there ...	108
Walter Hubert	113	Winfrid	91
Warning to us from the Church of		York, Synod at, A.D. 1195 ...	113
the 7th century	74	Zosimus Bishop of Rome, A.D.	
Westminster, Synod at	111	417	70
—— National Council at ...	111		



ERRATA.

- Page 7, line 28, for *disorganisation* read *disorganization*.
" 16, " 32, for *Whilgift* read *Whitgift*.
" 25, " 15, for *best* read *test*.
" 29, " 23, for *that* read *than*.
" 85, " 11, for *portui* read *potui*.
" 89, " 27, insert *time* between *some* and *after*.
" 102, " 20, for *dædibus* read *ædibus*.

THE
CLAIMS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
ON
NATIONAL SUPPORT.

PERHAPS in no former period of the history of the Holy Catholic Church, and especially of that part of it established in this kingdom, has there been so much excitement as in the present day. There is a restlessness both within and without, and the attention is directed to doctrine and discipline as well as to the distribution of its revenues. Notwithstanding the kindly consideration of this branch of the Catholic Church towards those who differ from her, with regard to any compulsory measures in the administration of the temporal affairs of the Church, the clamour has become louder and the demands intolerant. In the early ages of the Christian Church we read of one heresy arising after another which required the attention of those whose peculiar office it was to be depositories of the truth, and to whom there was an especial promise that they should be guided "into all truth." We do not find that the consideration of all the heresies that engaged the attention of the various Councils or Synods of the Church of the first few centuries was ever demanded at any one assembly of the successors of the Apostles. There seemed to be breathing times for the Church; and the mental energies of the champions of the Faith were never before directed to so many important points at once. With the Church of England at the present day it is otherwise. The assailants without, have increased, not merely in point of numbers, but in the variety of ways by which the attacks are made. Time after time within the recollection of most of the Clergy concessions have been

made to those who have applied for relief under the plea that their tender consciences were too much troubled. And what has been the result? Demand after demand has been pressed, and the Legislature, for the sake of peace, yielded to their importunity without sufficiently considering that the conscience is not always properly directed, and that ignorance and darkness may have the predominance over knowledge and light. In a world where evils are ever mingled with the good, the Catholic Church should remain steadfast to its principles without either exercising a persecuting spirit or allowing a worldly spirit to be mixed with its essential doctrines and wholesome rites and customs. It is as much as should be expected that Christian charity should allow those who differ from the Church to entertain their own views and mode of worship in peace and quietness, without disturbing the public peace and compelling others by every possible means to turn to their own peculiar way of thinking. In our own country we have seen too much of the evils arising from a kind but mistaken consideration for the feelings of tender consciences. Only look back a few years and consider the grievances which Dissenters then alleged as pressing heavily on their consciences. No sooner were these removed than fresh objections were raised, and the pressure seems to be stronger and stronger against the Established Church. The admission of so many men of contradictory and opposing forms of Christianity, and of others who care nothing about any sort of religion, into the House of Commons has contributed very much towards encouraging an hostile spirit against the Church of England. That so many hardly professing any one distinctive mark of the Christian character should be admitted into the councils of a Christian nation would astonish those holy spirits, who sacrificed every earthly consideration when on earth, and resigned their very lives, if they could appear among us in the present day. In some respects it was then as it is now, but in others it was different. There was often a hard pressure to yield to expediency at the sacrifice of Christian truth, but their firm adherence to the Faith, and their confidence in the promises to the Church, outweighed every other consideration. There was no throwing aside one portion of the truth in the hope of retaining the rest; and where Christian truth and argument did not prevail with the world in general, there were no admissions in favour of error. Those who were not influenced by pure Christian principles were never considered the best advisers and administrators, even in temporal things.

In the present day if a man has attained considerable tact and worldly policy he is too generally considered efficient in legislating on the spiritual no less than on the temporal affairs of the Church, notwithstanding his ignorance, carelessness, and indifference in regard to the true Christian spirit which should pervade every thought and action. When men are allowed to legislate for the Catholic Church who either deny or neglect the importance of Christian Sacraments and ordinances we have no right to expect from them any sympathy with the feelings of those whose thoughts are soaring heavenwards, and whose anxiety is to glorify God in every possible way. Christian charity may bear all things, but never can allow that the contradictory and inconsistent principles, which so much prevail among people who call themselves Christians, are ever likely to contribute to unity in the Christian Church. The plea so generally alleged in the present day for the admission of heterogeneous creeds into the Legislature of this professedly Christian country is not likely to contribute to the harmony of Church and State. In the administration of purely temporal affairs the variety of opinions may be attended with advantage, as each member may have had experience of a different sphere of observation. But in regard to spiritual affairs it is otherwise. In them we are directed to look to one, and only one, source of information. In the Divine Being "there is neither variableness nor shadow of turning," and, as such is the case, we have no right to relax the pure and consistent rules laid down for our guidance. We may take this course without denying proper toleration to those who differ from us.

This leads us to notice that there are two bodies or corporations which require our submission, and it is well when the two are so blended together as to promote the harmony and peace of a nation without calling forth the elements of discord. We are not without many instances in history, of the collisions which took place between the temporal and spiritual powers. When such is the case it militates very much against the welfare of a nation as well as the influence of the Church. The Church and the State are two distinct bodies. Wherever Christianity does not prevail, there are signs of a combination to regulate the good order of individuals, and into whatever part of the world you travel, even where there are nothing else but savages, you will find them in separate tribes or large bodies of individuals who have a chief over them, under whom they live, travel, and make

war, and ignorant and uncivilized as they may be, they look up to some higher Being and attend to their religious observances in conjunction with the temporal head of the tribe. This union of temporal affairs with the religious observances of the nation, however savage and uncultivated, tends to bind them more closely together both in peace and war. Are we then to despise a lesson from those whom we think so far below ourselves in learning, literature and civilization? The practice of the Patriarchs, whose faith is recorded with approbation in the Bible, seems to have descended to the numerous descendants of Adam in various parts of the globe, and shall we be almost the only nation in the world that thinks the influence of religion is unnecessary in the discharge of our temporal affairs? Think of the Grecians and Romans in the height of their polish and civilization, and you will find that they never separated their religion from the affairs of State. There seems to be a general admission that our affairs in this world cannot be properly regulated without looking to some higher and unseen Being. Whatever may have been the outward representation of their gods they certainly looked to them, or through them, as affording an assistance, which, beings like themselves, never could afford. How dare we attempt to deviate from the general practice of the human race, when we are sanctioned in such a course by an express revelation from that Being to whom we are accountable for our words, thoughts, and actions? To do so would be setting up our short-sighted policy in opposition to "the wisdom that is from above"—that wisdom which sanctioned in the Patriarchal times a combination of the civil and sacerdotal offices as may be seen repeatedly in the Book of Genesis.

Since, under the Mosaic dispensation, Church and State were incorporated, we cannot suppose that God would have instituted such a system, if an Established Church is at all likely to militate against the main object of religion and the national welfare. In the present day the national profession of religion is treated as if intrinsically evil, and were both an hindrance to the growth of those Christian graces which promote peace on earth, and an hindrance to the promotion of God's glory. The idea seems to be prevalent that the supreme governor in a State has no right to encourage one form of religion more than another. Whatever may be said against any specific directions to kings on ecclesiastical affairs, the duty of kings and rulers is apparent from the approbation of the Supreme Governor of the Universe when

Jewish kings exercised their authority on several occasions. Our Blessed Saviour spent the whole of His life in a country where there was a national religion, and where the public administration of affairs was mainly in the hands of heathens, yet we find that He conformed to the regulations of the ruling powers, both in ecclesiastical and civil matters, while He spoke in condemnation of the false glosses that had been given to many parts of the ceremonial and moral law. He never expressed the least disapprobation of union between the Church and the administration of national affairs, nor did St. Paul, when brought before Felix and Festus, resist or object to the civil power. He conformed with his own directions which he afterwards gave to the Romans, "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers, for the powers that be are ordained of God" [Rom. xiii. 1], and when he said, "I stand at Cæsar's judgment-seat, where I ought to be judged" [Acts xxv. 10]. Thus both our Saviour and His eminent Apostle were anxious that kings and their representatives should not be *unnecessarily* resisted in the discharge of their official duties, and looked forward to that glorious time in the Church when, according to prophecy, it was announced that "Kings shall be thy nursing fathers and their queens thy nursing mothers" [Isaiah xlix. 23]. If then kings would be nursing fathers and queens nursing mothers to the Church through the influence of Christianity, it follows that there will be co-operation between the highest civil authorities and the successors of those Apostles who were appointed by the Saviour and with whom the Saviour promised He would be to the end of the world. Where the spirit of holiness prevails there will not be a diversity of opposing operations, nor the exercise of contrary spirits in the practical requirements of society. The Holy Spirit never can influence the hearts and minds of God's people both for and against the designs of the Most High. The Church of the living God is always at unity with itself when under the influence of the Holy Ghost. The Holy Spirit of God is never the promoter of disturbance, discord, and confusion among some men, and the promoter of unity, peace, and concord among others. If there were a variety of gods influencing the world independently of each other there would be a variety of opinions, and diverse courses of action, causing confusion; but since there is but one God, we must expect the prevalence of uniformity in the actions of those Spirits that are under His immediate influence. It follows, then, that there will be no clashing

between the civil magistrate and the ministration of ecclesiastics.

This state of things presupposes the full and general influence of the Gospel of the Grace of God in every member of Church and State—a state of things hardly to be expected while the evils are mingled with the good. The extent to which this influence does not prevail, in any case, should lead us to see how deficient a nation may be in the true spirit of Christianity. Where the true influence of Christianity prevails differences of opinion on minor points give place to the essential characteristics of the Catholic Church. It is by the exercise of true Christian charity that “schism” is prevented in the body and that the members have the same care one for another [1 Cor. xii. 25].

To those who take the Sacred Scriptures as the note of their conduct, it is apparent that submission to the laws of the State in which we live is strongly inculcated so long as there is nothing required of us savouring of a renunciation of our Christian profession. While we enjoy the protection of the State over our persons and property we are undoubtedly called upon to contribute our proportion to those funds which are required for the exigencies of government. If we purchase a property subject to certain charges intended for a purpose in which we take no interest, we cannot reasonably withdraw the contribution we agreed to make under the plea that our consciences dictate otherwise. To those who reverence the Sacred Scriptures we may quote the words of the inspired writers, which are very clear on the point, “Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake; whether it be to the king as supreme; or unto governors as unto them that are sent by Him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well [1 Pet. ii. 13, 14]. Such is the advice given by St. Peter. St. Paul is equally as urgent on the same point. To Titus he says, “Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work, to speak evil of no man, to be no brawlers, but gentle, showing all meekness unto all men” [Titus iii. 1, 2], and again to the Romans, “Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers, for there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the

power? Do that which is good and thou shalt have praise of the same; for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake, for this cause pay ye tribute also; for they are God's ministers attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues, tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour" [Rom. xiii. 1—7].

The above directions were given at a period of the Church's history when there had been no Christian kings or emperors, Christians and Jews were expected to contribute tribute and custom even to those governments which were hostile to the spirit of Christianity without subjecting themselves to any reproaches of conscience for paying money that was due to a nation or individual that entertained opinions and practices that were quite opposed to their religious views. It is a common thing in the present day for men to allege conscience as an excuse for freeing themselves from liabilities which they are bound honourably to fulfil. It is a convenient excuse for doing what they please without restraint and control. Such a liberty, if indulged, renders all laws of little use for the maintenance of good order and the welfare of society. Now if conscience is to be satisfied, however erroneous and selfish it may be, we are likely to have little else but disorder, confusion, and disorganisation in the nation. In a large body of men the magistrate must judge from the external actions, who they are that have most regard for the peace and order of the civil community. Hypocrisy, imposture, and self-interest are apt to be united in acquiring some particular end. How often is the exercise of Christian Charity abused by many apparently good-natured individuals, who, rather than be considered ill-liberal, yield to the urgent demands made on their good nature. If a party becomes clamorous and menacing, concessions are made often with a view of appeasing them. But how seldom is the desired effect produced? Look back some forty years! Enumerate the list of grievances then alleged on the part of Dissenters against the Established Church of England. After that, consider how many have been removed; yet after all there is no abatement of the clamour, in consequence of having admitted so many hostile to the Church to legislate on matters of which so many are so very

ignorant, while others are warped by prejudice and self-interest.

We shall briefly notice the chief grievances then advanced, and for which a remedy was sought.

The first was the state of registration. The Dissenters cannot now say that their consciences are troubled by having their children baptized in the Church, in order to secure the civil advantages of registration. The Registration Acts have removed this difficulty. Secondly, with respect to the marriage law, they are not obliged to attend the religious service of a Church to which they are hostile. Relief has been given by the 6 & 7 William IV., c. 85. Thirdly, with respect to the Burial of the Dead: Dissenters have been allowed to have portions of public cemeteries allotted to them with a chapel independently of one belonging to the Church of England, and facilities have been afforded by the Legislature of meeting their wishes wherever required.

Notwithstanding the removal of this alleged grievance there is an attempt now made to allow Dissenting ministers to bury in *our* Churchyards, which were originally given for burial places of members of the Catholic Church of England. This is not dealing with us fairly or charitably. We wish to retain those burial grounds which were given by the liberality of our forefathers, where the remains of many generations of our forefathers are deposited; and why should they seek to defile the soil that has been held sacred in the remembrance by many pure and holy associations, by conducting thereon services repulsive in many respects to our feelings, and perhaps often teeming with irreligious and anti-Christian doctrines, when the Legislature might as easily secure a piece of land by such measures as are adopted in the recent educational Act of Parliament wherever it is required. They do not seem content with this course of procedure, but evidently are aiming to secure the very churches themselves, as appears from steps recently taken in Parliament.

Fourthly, with respect to the exclusion of Dissenters from the Universities, they have no just reason to complain. They can have educational establishments of their own and there are many such institutions, but members of the Church of England have never shown the least disposition to interfere either with the endowments or course of instruction belonging to them. Why should Dissenters wish to interfere with the scholastic institutions of the Church of England, which are not national property, but founded and endowed through the liberality of individuals *long antecedent* to the origin of

the various sects which are in existence in this country? When funds were given voluntarily for the specific object of education in the principles and discipline of our branch of the Catholic Church, it would be as iniquitous to alienate them and divert them to an object never contemplated by the founders, as if we should use our endeavours to interfere with the control of voluntary subscriptions or endowments belonging to the educational establishments of Dissenters. If such a principle should be encouraged in Parliament the security of private property would be imperilled, there would soon be an end of all honourable and honest feeling in the country.

Fifthly, with respect to tithes. Without making any observations on the disputes that arose in reference to tithes, we may observe that grievances have been removed by the Commutation Acts passed in the last and present reigns. Farmers, whether Dissenters or Churchmen, have no reason to complain; and as for Church Rates, they have been so arranged as to free even professing Churchmen from the liability if they choose; there is no reason on the part of Dissenters to complain of them. There is something about the Compulsory Church Rate Abolition Act which reminds us of the spoliation of Church property at the Reformation. No doubt self-interest induced many to acquiesce in the spoliation and misappropriation which then took place. The disposal of so much land and tithe, either as gifts or sold at a very low price, was a great inducement to acquiesce in the measures of Henry VIII. We do not see that in this improved commercial and mercantile age human nature is more upright and honourable, when a direct advantage presents itself. In agricultural districts the farmers, even those who loudly profess that they are Churchmen, cannot, in most cases, resist the opportunity of taking advantage of the recent Church Rate Act, when they have it in their power to avoid paying a few pounds per annum. But their short-sighted policy, which only looks at the present gain, never inclines them to suspect that the landlord is keen enough to see that when the tenant has not to pay so many rates, the rent may be advanced, and, if not done immediately, they must expect that the money they refuse to pay voluntarily in lieu of Church Rates, will have to be paid, perhaps with addition, in the shape of rent. The neglect of tenants in supporting schools in many agricultural districts is likely to entail on themselves greater expense, for the recent School Act considers the tenants liable to the support

of Board Schools, whereas, by moderate contributions, assisted by the landlords in time past, education might have progressed in the country, and have prevented in some places a much more expensive procedure, while a religious education in the principles of the Church might have been secured. It is to the interest of the landlords to encourage School Boards; for all expenses attending the erection of schools and their annual support will necessarily fall on the tenants, while they themselves are freed from the payment of annual subscriptions, which were usually expected from and contributed by the landlords. On some of our largest estates most of the tenants are men of very limited education, in many cases very little, if anything, better than that of their labourers. These men are not likely to appreciate a good education, and therefore think it unnecessary to spend more than a mere trifle in the support of schools, while the landlord, who may be a lay impropiator to a considerable extent, does not see the necessity of making restitution for the misappropriation of property belonging to the churches and charitable institutions in any measure commensurate with the rental of his estate.

The abolition of Church Rates was considered a point, which if attained would soon decide the severance between Church and State. The 31 & 32 Victoria, c. 109 has certainly brought to light who are the disinterested and cordial supporters of the Church of England. Unfortunately it is too generally thought that if Parliament can do a thing the right and honesty of the measure is not to be questioned. Church Rates are not to be looked upon simply as a tax. Their antiquity is far greater than any tax, and this is tacitly implied in dealing with them as it did by a special Act. In A.D. 928 they were ordered by Act of Parliament to be paid *as well as* tithes. In A.D. 1018 Parliament declared that independent of tithe all people are bound to assist in repairing of churches. There is no doubt but that property when it came to be sold was estimated at a higher rate if free from the payment of certain charges. A farm, whether bought or rented, will bring a larger sum or a greater rent if free from all rates and taxes and other outgoings. When a man rents a farm subject to the above charges his conscience allows him to pay less rent, and his conscience experiences no uneasiness in accepting the terms. But as soon as there is a plausible excuse his conscience becomes quite elastic, especially when he can make it convenient to put into his own pocket what ought to be paid for an especial purpose.

The decision of Parliament satisfies his conscience and he is willing to accept a share of the plunder which others have unfairly secured. The excuse which satisfies such tender consciences is that they themselves did not make the law and that as the law is in force they are justified in availing themselves of any advantage likely to accrue from it. Those who plead such excuses seem to forget that the guilt of securing what belongs to another consists in sending persons to represent them in Parliament who entertain and in most cases profess their determination to violate the ancient title to property. We fear that self-interest operates very powerfully in returning representatives to Parliament. Of late years many tests have been withdrawn, whether for good or evil time will undoubtedly show. In the early history of our nation the kings took care to be advised by the wisest and most learned and experienced. But of late years, since there has been so much under the name of literature of a flimsy and exciting character, self-sufficient men have arisen who consider that the popular voice is always sure to be right, and that men unaccustomed to control, or to any discipline whatever, whether mental or bodily have an equal right to decide important matters. The right of private judgment has been carried *far beyond* its proper bounds. With some the right of private judgment seems to imply that they may do as they like. We cannot help men *thinking* as they please, but *doing* as they please is another matter. No one has a right to disturb the peace of a society by breaking the rules of that society to which he belongs. It savours nothing of Christian charity to pacify those who have consciences more tender than those of Christ and His Apostles, who not only inculcated the payment of taxes, but even paid them to a Church which had become so deserving of reproof as the Jewish Church had, as well as to governments which were conducted in the darkness of heathenism, and which supported idolatrous worship. This reminds us that there are according to the Sacred Writings, two bodies to which we are to be subject: the Civil Magistrate and the Church. These are two distinct powers "ordained of God." In those parts of the world where the Church has not influenced the inhabitants, there seems to be the existence of some Civil power. Even the uncivilized who know not the True and Living God, have among themselves some laws by which they are governed, and the existence of chiefs among them implies a centre of unity of

action and subjection to powers set over them. Without such an ordinance there would be nothing but confusion in the world. In natures lower than man in the scale of creation—creatures not endowed with the higher intellectual endowments, there is a similar procedure, instigated by what is commonly termed instinct. This may be observed in the habits of animals, birds, and insects. The gregarious nature of many animals, the mode of migration in birds, the habits of the ant and bee among insects, intimate that the all-wise Creator of the universe has considered the adherence of individuals in a community as a method most likely to preserve order and unity of action. I thus allude to natural objects that those who are at all sceptical, or inclined to infidelity, may see that in civil government, as well as in the arrangements of the Church, there is nothing in the revealed will of God that is contrary to the constitution of the works of nature, although there may be much in the Bible that could not be otherwise made known. We are assailed on all sides, not only by the various sects of Dissenters, but also by those who do not openly profess any religion whatever; and there are not wanting a vast number within the pale of our own Branch of the Church whose religious views are anything but favourable to belief in the Divine Person of the Redeemer. The vast amount of irreligion, infidelity, and scepticism, is astonishing in a country that has been so instrumental in sending the light of Gospel truth to distant and idolatrous lands. If we do not take care, we may be like those once favoured nations from whom the “candlestick” has been removed. History is not without its warnings on this point. There has been too great a desire to treat as indifferent the essential truths of Christianity in order to compromise any difference of opinion. Toleration has been much misunderstood, while charity has been extended so far beyond its proper bounds as to endeavour to conciliate persons of opinions opposed to some of the essential truths of the Gospel. There may have been in some a disposition to conciliate at the sacrifice of some very material points of the Christian faith; but what result does history tell us there has been when conciliation has been attempted? A steady settled purpose has always been the most successful course in attaining any end. When so many points are yielded, it betokens doubtfulness, and this only encourages the opposite party to persevere. We have an instance of this in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, when Bishop Grindall, at the solicitation of Calvin, entreated the

Queen to tolerate the settlement of the French Protestants in A.D. 1560, on the principles of Calvin. The Queen assigned to the French exiles the Church of St. Anthony, with liberty to adopt the Genevan discipline, and set up a form of prayer not at all like that of the English Liturgy. This, however, tended to promote the advancement of the Presbytery in the place of Episcopacy. Through this they increased so much in eight years that they became very troublesome, and did not confine themselves to the privileges allowed them by the toleration. The Queen clearly saw that (to use her own words) "such were the restless spirits of that factious people that no quiet was to be expected from them till they were utterly suppressed." In A.D. 1592 an Act of Parliament was passed against them, and put into execution. Several of them were executed on account of treasonable practices to which they were instigated by the self-willed principles of Nonconformity.*

It requires a considerable share of prudence and acquaintance with the proceedings of man in all ages as developed in history, as well as the influence of *true* Christian Charity to settle the boundaries of toleration. If we advert to the records of ages past, we shall find that evils arose from a too rigid rule of conformity, as well as from *too great* liberty in their proceedings. The Civil Government is expected to keep turbulent spirits in order. The peace of the country is not to be disturbed through ignorance and self-will. There must be in any body of men, whether for civil or religious purposes, an observance of order, decency and regularity. States in existence before the introduction of Christianity were subject to laws and governors, but when the influence of heavenly grace has been infused through the instrumentality of the Church, the laws of the State become divested of their unseemly harshness, while the hearts of converts become more pure, lively and holy, so as to become less inclined to violate the decency and order of society. When the two distinct bodies Church and State become united in their efforts, when according to the intimations of prophecy, "Kings become nursing fathers to the Church and Queens her nursing mothers" [Isaiah xlix. 23], the jarring discord arising from divisions will subside, and peace be diffused through the whole community. "The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion, and the fatling together

* Camden's Elizabeth.

and a little child shall lead them, and the cow and the bear shall feed, their young ones shall lie down together, and the lion shall eat straw like the ox and the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp and the weaned child shall play on the cockatrice den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea" [Isaiah xi. 6—9]. When this blessed state of things is violated, there is in all probability deficiency of the true spirit of Christianity on the one hand, while on the other there is perhaps too easy compliance with pressing demands in regard to liberty of conscience, although the Christian character is expected to be firm and steadfast without exercising harshness and persecution. After the death of Queen Elizabeth we find that King James relaxed the strictness of his predecessor, and what was the result? The Nonconformists, who had experienced much toleration in the earlier part of Queen Elizabeth's reign, and in consequence of indulgence had become so factious as to require restraint, when the reins of authority under James were relaxed, increased their demands and urged them with greater intensity. The factious spirits, who had experienced kindly consideration, were not satisfied with being allowed to serve God in their own way which they were allowed by toleration, but were determined to compel others to adopt their own way of worship. They did what they could to deny that indulgence to others which they themselves had received. So long as their consciences were not disturbed through having the Cross at Baptism, bowing at the name of Jesus, and wearing the surplice, the least we might have expected from them was to allow others to use such rites and ceremonies as they considered perfectly admissible. It was not so! The result was the Conference at Hampton Court, and when we consider the troubles that ensued we may see how little dependence may be placed on what is called "conscientious scruples" as the basis of action. We are not without evidence that those who plead the loudest for liberty of conscience are the least disposed to grant that liberty to others, and the greater the indulgence that is granted the greater will be the demands for increase of liberty. An easy compliance with the ways of others has tended to the increase of those very opinions and practices which there was an anxiety to suppress by conciliatory measures that were admitted at the sacrifice of religious principles. When we look over the history of the reigns of James I. and his son Charles I. we cannot help

noticing that demands increased *as fast* as concessions were made. We have some very striking words written at this period in that remarkable book "*Eikon Basilike*" cap. 5, "It was his suffering them to get to the pinnacle of the temple that so tempted them to cast him down headlong." After all the concessions made to ease their consciences by increasing toleration, those who experienced that privilege did not extend to others that toleration which they had reason to expect.

It is notorious that those who so strongly clamoured for serving and worshipping God according to their conscience, when they had obtained a more prominent position, and could have their own way, were most arbitrary. During the rebellion the success of the Dissenters in their military operations encouraged them to be more stringent in their Councils. They felt the more determined to establish more completely *their* own Church discipline. They passed an ordinance for the public use of their "Directory," with a penalty upon such as should use the Common Prayer, and forty shillings forfeiture, upon every one each time officiating that did not use the Directory, as also that all the Common Prayer Books should be carried in to the Committees of each county, by them to be disposed of as the Parliament should direct (*Dugdale's Civil Wars*, 1645).^{*} Such were the proceedings of those who clamoured so much for toleration and liberty of conscience. *Dugdale* says: "Certain it is that as they grew in strength and power so their insolence, which thus prompted them to decline all good expedients for accommodation, increased more and more. Nevertheless his Majesty, not totally despairing but that by farther concessions he might move this hard-hearted generation, sent unto them his eighth message" on 29th January, 1645. After stating several particulars in the message he proceeds thus—"And for religion to give liberty that all those who were unwilling to communicate with the Church of England in the Service already established by Act of Parliament should not be urged thereto, Provided that all other Protestants behaving themselves peaceably and quietly in and towards

^{*} During the rebellion there was the following enactment, 11th August, 1645:—"If any person or persons whatsoever shall at any time or times hereafter use or cause to be used the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England in any church, chapel, or *private house* within the kingdom of England and Wales, every person so offending shall for the first offence pay five pounds (equal to more than three times that sum now); ten pounds for the second, and for the third *shall suffer* one year's imprisonment without bail or mainprize."

the Civil Government should have the free exercise of theirs; tendering unto them a general Act of Pardon and Oblivion; which gracious message so full of condescension produced from them nothing in effect but scorn and contempt."

The warnings of history are such as to impress us with the opinion, that while conciliation and toleration are granted to any sect or body of men, there should be some safeguard to prevent their interference with the religious liberty of those who differ from them. I think we shall generally find that those most clamorous for liberty and toleration, are the most overbearing when they come into power, and deny to others what they so imperatively demanded for themselves. King James I., when speaking of the Presbytery, who made large professions and protestations to him, declared of that sect "that no deserts could oblige; no oaths or promises bind them." For as Dugdale says—"Notwithstanding those, their solemn oaths and protestations, they most perfidiously acted contrary to them, hastening thereby their further ruin, which soon afterwards befel the Church of England, and at length terminated in the woeful murder of their native Sovereign, as is notoriously known to the world, carrying on all this under the colour and veil of their Solemn League and Covenant."*

Under Archbishop Grindall the interest and increase of separation was promoted by sanction to Half-Conformists, who by their underhand ways contributed more to the danger of the Church than the professed opponents. Indecision and too much anxiety to make things comfortable to the consciences of those who separate, has tended more perhaps than anything else, to lower the doctrine, discipline, and services of the Church in the estimation of Dissenters. Archbishop Whilgift, who succeeded Archbishop Grindall in 1583, declared it impossible "to defend the religion and rites of the Church of England, to appease the schisms and sects therein, to reduce the ministers thereof to uniformity and due obedience, if after a long risk of liberty Dissenters had any countenance showed them," adding "that if any way were given to their clamour and surmises, it would cause that confusion which hereafter the State would be sorry for." The experience of both Episcopalians and Nonconformists has brought them to the conclusion that toleration (if not properly regulated) may tend to confusion in Church and State. And it is remarkable that the very party who had

* Dugdale, 1646.

gained connivance and toleration saw the evils resulting from them, although they had advocated them and advanced into power through their means. This partly accounts for the stringent measures which Nonconformists adopted towards Episcopalians after they had succeeded in their object. Richard Baxter, in his *Ep. Ded.* to his treatise of *Self-denial*, calls "toleration England's misery, a liberty for drawing men to hell, a wicked damning liberty, a strengthening the party tolerated, a making way for their power, a giving away our own power, a preparing faggots for our own martyrdom," &c. This same Richard Baxter, in his examination of Mr. Tomb's *Præcursor*, (sect. 13) speaks thus—"That 'tis for separation that so many in so many parts of the land have turned ranters, blasphemers, and commonly unclean that seemed religious, yea some downright infidels so that not only the *Racovian Catechism*, but the most hellish book that ever was written (called the *Three Grand Impostors*) labouring to prove Christ a deceiver, was printed in London. Such enthusiasm there was, that women ran naked in the assemblies, and men went about the streets saying that they were Christ: that this their wickedness spread far and near. I cannot hear (says Mr. Baxter) of one among a multitude that comes to this fearful pass by any other way than first turning to Anabaptistry and Separation, and then to vilify the Ministry, and then who knows whither?"

It is evident from the admission of Separatists that schism in any body leads to the dissolution of that body, and the disturbance of the community. To check such confusion Church and State have a right to interfere. The peace of a nation is not to be disturbed by the factious conduct of any individual or individuals, and this is best done by the Civil Magistrate. But there is another body, which, if supported by the State, is calculated, through the gracious influence imparted through its instrumentality, to allay the passions of human nature, and bring the most discordant spirits into harmony with each other—I allude to the Catholic Church, which, when adopted by kings and nursed by queens, is calculated to subdue turbulent spirits. Whoever knows anything of the gracious influence of God the Holy Ghost, and has tasted of His graciousness, must acknowledge that peace is characteristic of the Gospel. If "unto him that smiteth thee on the one cheek" you are commanded to "offer also the other" [Luke vi. 29], it is clear that violence and coercion are opposed to the spirit of the Gospel; but this precept implies that there is to be a steady

and firm adherence to the principles and faith of the Gospel. There is to be no attempt to conciliate the opponents of Gospel faith and precepts, by yielding the importance and necessity of any one essential doctrine or course of conduct as indifferent and unimportant. Steadfastness in the Faith is repeatedly enjoined in the Bible. Lukewarmness is condemned; and what is yielding up important Articles of Faith to please and conciliate designing men but treating what God has revealed as indifferent and unimportant? I am aware that in the present day the opinion is very prevalent that all professions of religion are equally good, (and such is the liberality of the age,) that the various forms of Christianity, however wild and irrational, are equally good in securing the happiness of man, both here and hereafter. It is a common saying, that "so long as we go to some place of worship it matters not where." When an expression of this sort is made use of to the illiterate and uneducated there is no knowing where the mischief ends. Mischief, and great mischief may be done to society by the *unqualified* admission, that religion under *any* form may be productive of good to individuals or society. It is taken for granted by a vast number, that if a person only thinks or persuades himself that what he does is right, he is at liberty to do it. This way of thinking is adopted without persons striving to inform themselves on the subject, and the same way of thinking is adopted in regard to the religion of the nation. The religion which should be professed by the Government they say should be the religion of the majority; or, as others think, either there should be no national religion, or else all forms of religion treated alike. Now this presupposes that all religions are equally good, or may be all alike dispensed with. We have seen enough of this liberal way of thinking in ages past, and surely those who know anything of history cannot neglect taking warning. We hear a great deal in the present day about the separation of Church and State. We are not told precisely what Dissenters mean by this separation. It is evident that a confiscation of Church property is contemplated by some on the alleged ground that it is national property, and that our churches belong to the nation. It requires a very limited knowledge of history, and especially of Church history, to discover that our churches were built and endowed by private individuals, and not out of the national funds. We hear even in the present day of private individuals building churches and endowing them for the security of permanent ministrations out of their

own private property, and so settled and invested as to secure them for that branch of the Holy Catholic Church established in these kingdoms, and the Church of England has as much right to retain the liberal contributions of individuals voluntarily given as some Independents and Socinians have to retain in their possession, endowments bestowed by the voluntary grants of their members. The State secures to each their property. What Dissenters mean by the separation of Church and State is not very clear. If they think that the Sovereign and her Ministers are not to profess their attachment to any form of religion whatever, where is then the toleration and liberty of conscience which are so much advocated? Is the Sovereign not to worship God according to her conscience, and is she violating the Divine Will when she becomes a nursing mother to the Church according to that Holy Book which was given from Heaven? This would be a great inconsistency. If the nation should have granted some pecuniary assistance at any time towards building churches or endowing them, it can only be looked upon as a voluntary contribution, and affords no reason for the State at any future time to exercise a control over it. When a voluntary contribution is given for any charitable object it at once merges into the funds of the society, and no one would ever dream of applying to Parliament for power to take it back. So in regard to any grant that may have been made to the Church by the legislative power of the nation years ago, when the nation professed its adherence to the Church, it is hardly reasonable for succeeding generations to say that because the majority in Parliament are of the same way of thinking, the *voluntary* grant or subscription may be taken back. But suppose that grant had been expended generations ago for the demands of the day, you could not possibly recover it, nor could you make a claim on anyone as a violator of a trust. A voluntary contribution or grant is for an immediate and special object. - The person who receives it is alone accountable for the proper disposal. But suppose the person to whom it was given should think proper to invest it in the hands of an individual for an especial purpose, embracing the object of the donor, this does not alter the case legally. If the person or nation who made the gift resigned the right, and never thought of securing its future appropriation, future generations have no right to interfere with other peoples' liberality.

Let us come to our own time. A kind-hearted and liberal individual presents a handsome sum to some institution;

would it be *fair* for the Parliament to take it in their own hands and dispose of it any way it thought proper, and grant it to an object never contemplated by the donor? If we view the Church and its endowments in this light, we shall see the unreasonableness of alienation or misappropriation. Besides it is so contrary to the constitution and common law of this country. This, with some, is of no consequence. If they can attain certain ends, they care not by what means. Clamour on one side, and want of steadfastness on the other have contributed more than anything else to the increase of demands. Toleration has not been enough for some, as soon as they attained that point they could not endure others to differ from them, as we have already seen. Something more than simple toleration is requisite for the peace, comfort, and good order of a nation. Toleration must have its limits. If those who differ from us are allowed to enjoy their own way of thinking in regard to religion, there should be some security that those who allowed that liberty should not be interfered with and compelled to relinquish any part of their faith and mode of discipline. We find that the reverse has been too often the case. History has its warnings, if attended to. Unfortunately too little attention is paid either to profane or ecclesiastical history, which are both useful in the development of the dealings of Divine Providence, and show how God is with and protects His Church. It is most unjust and unreasonable that those who enjoy toleration should attempt to force the Church of England, or any body of Dissenters, to adopt any particular faith and mode of discipline. We find this has been too much the case since toleration and liberty have been so extensively permitted. We have already alluded to the period of the Civil War during the reign of Charles I. and the Commonwealth. We find that when concessions are made to Dissent, the demands increase, and an opportunity is afforded of extending its influence. In the early days of the Christian Church toleration was pleaded as a preliminary step for the advancement of a party. St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, wrote several epistles on evils attending toleration. We have his sentiments on this point in an epistle to Vincentius (Ep. 48), in which he declares, he was once for toleration, but that he had altered his opinion. He also says elsewhere :—

“Eo modo nomen Christi de terris perire putavit, si sacrilegas dissentiones liberas esse permisit.”—St. Aug., Epist. 166.

"Quae caedes a vobis factae postquam Julianus Basilicas tradidit."—Aug., Ep. 48.

"Nulla bestia mansueta dicitur, quod neminem mordet, cum dentes et ungues non habet."—Aug. Ep. 166.

How was it that Julian, the apostate, proceeded in order to extirpate Christianity? He tolerated the meeting of the Donatists, the schismatics of the day (which had been restricted by Constantine), as the most likely plan to extirpate Christianity. So we are informed by St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, in his epistle to Donatus. It appears, from the experience of former ages, that those who on trifling pretexts are unwilling to conform, are likely to increase in number, as well as in their demands when indulged and allowed to interfere with others. With all the indulgence which Dissenters have received, and their expressions of satisfaction and limitation to their desires, they have increased their demands, and, of late years, have sought to interfere with the doctrines, discipline, and revenues of the Church of England. In doing so, it is evident that they seek temporal authority, and it shows that there is a restless and worldly spirit in Dissent.

In Bishop Horsley's account of the past history of Dissent, and his opinion of what he expected on their part in future, we of the present day see his expectations verified, and therefore should take warning in admitting them into offices likely to throw into their hands influence and power over the Established Church. In the "Review of the Case of Protestant Dissenters," by Bishop Horsley, we are informed, notwithstanding public promises, that they would be satisfied, their demands only would increase until the British Constitution is completely overthrown.* The opinion of Bishop Horsley has been confirmed in subsequent times. In the year 1834, at a public meeting held at the Town Hall,

* Bishop Horsley, in his "Review of the case of Protestant Dissenters," makes the following observations:—"In the year 1772, when the Dissenters were petitioning for relief from the subscriptions required by the first of William and Mary, public promises were made in the name of the body *in the strongest words which language could supply*, that the Dissenting ministers would, if gratified in that respect, esteem their toleration perfect, and never extend their wishes to any further indulgence. Since then things may come within ambitious view, far beyond what is now demanded; what security can the Nonconformists give that they will feel themselves more bound by the promises of 1787 than they are bound by those of 1772. Should the test laws be now repealed Dissenters will be Dissenters still; their influence will be increased, while their prejudices will remain entire; Government will have thrown down the best barrier against innovation, and the work of reform will go on till one stone will not be left upon another of the admired fabric of the British Constitution."

Reading, on March 4th, "to adopt measures for the relief of the grievances under which the Protestant Dissenters labour," a Dissenting minister, J. H. Hinton, said: "If the Church will only be neutral while the sectaries obtain their demands, very well; if not, we (the Dissenters) will join the Infidels and Papists in their attack on her property, as well as privileges" (*Berkshire Chronicle*).

It is now forty years since the above was declared at a public meeting. At the time it was considered injudicious and premature, and the members of the Church of England were lulled through several leading Dissenters expressing an opinion on some points favourable to the Church. But since then, notwithstanding the removal of what they termed grievances, the spirit of opposition has increased and farther demands are made. There seems a disposition to interfere with the doctrines, discipline, and revenues of the Church of England. The Church has not been sufficiently alive to the dangers arising from Dissent. This has been owing in some measure to general inattention to national and general history, both civil and ecclesiastical. The past history of our Church since the Reformation teems with many a lesson on the struggles which have taken place on the part of ambitious and turbulent spirits to bring down the doctrines and discipline of the Church to a level with their own narrow and selfish views, while they had an eye on the revenues. On November 16, A.D. 1646, that Episcopal government might never return again, they passed an ordinance for the sale of all the lands belonging to the Bishops, with special instructions therein for the Contractors and surveyors. About this time also there was a committee appointed to enquire into the value of all Church livings, "*in order to the planting of an able ministry*." The historian Dugdale informs us what sort of ministry was considered able.*

"Moreover," as he says, "as they took care to disable those of the clergy which were orthodox and loyal from

* "And that Episcopal Government might never return again, they passed (16 Nov.) an ordinance for the sale of all the lands belonging to the bishops, with special instructions therein for the contractors and surveyors, amongst which instructions, it is not the least observable, that for the better encouraging of purchasers, they should sell them at ten years' purchase. Nay such was their care to make this sacrilegious work as plausible to the people as might be, that, besides the extraordinary pay their surveyors of those lands had, (viz., twenty shillings a day, and five shillings a day to every boy that did but carry the end of the measuring chain), they gave special directions that the gentry and other popular men residing in those parts where such lands lay, should be feasted by the surveyors (which feasts amounted to no small charge), saying we must pay well and hang well

preaching any more, so to encourage all others who were for their turn, though not at all qualified with learning, they gave liberty to every bold and schismatical mechanic to preach under the notion of *gifted men*. To which purpose an ordinance (4 Nov., A.D. 1646) was brought into the House and read for approving of such illiterate persons to be ministers.”*

This *should* be, but it is *not*, a warning in the present day. There is a desire on the part of some, mostly priests of the Church of England, to introduce lay preaching, under what restrictions it does not appear very clearly. It is the opinion of some that uneducated men of a certain class and grade in society are more likely to be understood by the uneducated classes, and that preaching should be in such language and phraseology as they are accustomed to. This course is never likely to raise the standard of education, but rather the reverse. If the uneducated classes do not in all cases understand sermons it is not owing so much to words of which they do not know the meaning, as a want of clearness in handling the subject. The best educated and most learned men are generally the best understood by the lower and uneducated classes. The humble classes in our parishes soon see the difference between an educated and an uneducated clergy, and in all cases an educated clergyman has far more influence. Very little progress is likely to be made when the people can say, “We understand him; *he tells us what we know*.”†

* About this time also, there was a committee appointed (11 Nov.) to inquire into the value of all Church livings in order to the *planting of an able ministry* as they gave out; whereas in truth it was to discover which were the best and fattest benefices, to the end that the principal champions for the *cause*, might make choice of those for themselves (whereof some had three a piece and some four, as is very well known), it being apparent that where any small benefice was, there the Church doors were shut up. The more to justify which practice of theirs, I could name an Assembly man who, being told by an eminent person that a certain church in the West of England had no incumbent, asked what the yearly value of the benefice did amount unto, and he, answering fifty pounds *per annum*, the Assembly man replied, “*If it be no better worth, no Godly man will accept of it.*”—Dugdale’s Short View, &c., p. 225.

† “If in the Apostles’ times, when as yet much of Scripture was scarcely written, when God wrought with men miraculously to inform their understanding, and supplied by revelation what man’s industry could not yield; if, I say, in these times St. Paul required ‘diligent reading,’ and expressly forbade greenness of scholarship, much more, then, are these conditions required in our times, wherein God doth not supply by miracle our natural defects, and yet the burden of our possession is infinitely increased. All that was necessary in the Apostles’ times is now necessary, and much more. For if we add unto the growth of Christian learning as it was in the Apostles’ times but this one circumstance (to say nothing of the rest), which naturally befalls our times, and could not be required at the hands of those who guided the first ages of the Church—that is, the knowledge of the state and succession of doctrine in the

In the present day there is a disposition to lower the standard of education, and some even of the clergy advocate it, with what view I do not say. Time will show. An Act was passed, 17 Charles II., c. 3, "For uniting churches in cities and towns corporate," the preamble of which is as follows: "Inasmuch as the selected provision for ministers in most cities and towns corporate within this realm is not sufficient for the maintenance of able ministers fit for such places, whereby mean and stipendiary preachers are entertained to serve the cures there who, wholly depending for their maintenance upon the good-will and liking of their auditors, have been and are thereby under temptation of too much complying and suiting their doctrine and teaching to the humour rather than good of their auditors which has been a great occasion of faction and schism and of the contempt of the ministry." There is an attempt on the part of some to raise, as they say, the standard of requirements for the sacred ministry. If by raising the standard they mean training them almost exclusively from early years for the duties of the sacred office they will soon find, I fear, that an education almost exclusively devoted to mere professional requirements is the least likely course to promote professional superiority. Vast and varied information relative to the past and present state of society, the habits and tone of thinking prevalent around us, besides a knowledge of the works of nature, all these contribute towards an efficient ministry. If we are to have the clergy unfit to mix with the more educated classes of society, if, through

Church from time to time, a thing very necessary for the determining the controversies of these our days, how great a portion of our labour and industry would this alone require."—Hales' Sermon, 2 Peter iii. 3—16.

"As the times now are, wherein learning aboundeth, even unto wantonness, and wherein the world is full of questions, and controversies, and novelties, and niceties in religion, and wherein most of our gentry, very women and all (by the advantage of long peace, and the custom of modern education, together with the help of a multitude of English books and translations), are able to look through the ignorance of a clergyman and censure it, if he be tripping on any point of history, cosmography, moral or natural philosophy, divinity or the arts; yea, to chastise his very method and phrase, if he speaks loosely or impertinently, or but improperly, and if everything be not point wise, I say, as these times are, I would not have a clergyman content himself with every mediocrity of gifts; but by his prayers, care, and industry, improve those he hath, so as he may be able upon good occasion to impart a spiritual gift to the people of God whereby they might be established, and to speak with such understanding, and sufficiency, and pertinacity, especially when he hath just warning and a convenient time to prepare himself in some good measure of proportion to the quickness and ripeness of these present times, as they that love not his coat may yet approve his labours, and not find anything therein whereat justly to quarrel."—Bishop Sanderson's Sermon 3, ad. Clev.

their deficiency and want of education, they cannot gain influence among that class, the poor and illiterate perceive it, and are less likely to be influenced by them. The uneducated classes are keen enough to see when the clergy have no influence with their superiors, and this tends very much to lead them to despise the ministrations of such clergy. I have alluded to this circumstance because some of the clergy who are anxious for the ministrations of such as are alluded to above are only aiding the views of Dissenters in lessening the influence of the Church of England, and facilitating their admission into a ministry which they are conscious may improve their worldly position. What Bishop Horsley said is verified in the present day, "should the best laws be now repealed *Dissenters will be Dissenters still.*" We have seen in our own day that any attempts to satisfy the consciences of Dissenters only encourage them to increase their demands. When we consider what concessions have been made within the last forty years, the many grievances, as they termed them, that have been removed one might wonder what further reason they could have to complain. The events of the last few years disclose the secret and chief end of their agitations. There has been an interference with the consciences of members of the Church of England and an *expressed* anxiety that abuses should be rectified—abuses, as they term them, which can only affect Churchmen and not themselves. Why not leave abuses, if there be any, to be rectified by Churchmen? There is an unnecessary interference and such as *they* never would allow Churchmen to exercise towards themselves. Where is their Christian charity? They seem to forget that they should do unto others as they would others should do to them.

The threat at Reading, in 1834 (however unlikely it might seem at the time), that Dissenters would "join with the Infidels and Papists" in their attack on the Church's "property and privileges" has not been allowed to lie dormant. Of late Infidels and Papists have gained places in the House of Commons, and, unfortunately, candidates at elections, anxious to secure seats in Parliament, try to please the people by making concessions. There has been too much attention to the voice of the people, as if what they think is sure to be right. Whoever knows anything of an election of an M.P. must confess that a variety of motives influence the electors, and that individuals are secured either as friends or agents, to whom many a voter cannot refuse promising support except at a risk of some detriment to his

affairs. In this way many have been brought into Parliament independently of directly corrupt practices. It must appear by this that the State requires the influence of another body, which is calculated to enable it to avoid extremes, and let its "moderation be known unto all men" [Phill. iv. 5]. That influence is nothing less than that of the Holy Spirit through the instrumentality of the Church, which is the "Body of Christ." I am aware that some say the Holy Spirit is not confined to any particular body or collection of men. To enter upon this subject at present would be premature and divert us from the present line of argument. I would only now ask, can you expect the fulfilment of the promises of the Holy Spirit through Mahometanism or Hindooism? If not, ask, Why not? and you will very soon come to the conclusion that the Holy Spirit is not to be obtained anywhere, nor through connection with every community, professing what religion it may. We certainly cannot limit the influence of God's Holy Spirit, but we nevertheless must *look* only for its influence through that particular body termed the Church, to which there is an especial promise.

But to return more particularly to the combination of Dissenters, Paptists, and Infidels, who have gained through toleration admission into the House of Commons, where they are allowed, contrary to the principles of toleration, to interfere with the doctrines, discipline, and temporal effects of the Church of England. They have been so bold of late as to attempt inquiry into the endowments of the Church of England, without even once saying a word about the endowments that have been given to Dissenting meeting-houses. This shows a disposition to interfere with the revenues of the Church of England in a way they are not disposed to do towards those of meeting-houses. I do not mention this with the view of pressing inquiry into the endowments of the various sects of Protestantism. If such measures as have been proposed of late be carried into execution the security of every kind of property will be worth very little. Late proceedings only show how a combined party of Dissenters, Paptists, and Infidels would deal with the Church of England. The spoliation at the Reformation is advanced as a precedent for interfering with the revenues of the Church of England. If we examine the proceedings in Parliament and Convocation at that period we shall find that what Henry VIII. did in an arbitrary manner had at least the *semblance* of law. He was careful to

have his measures sanctioned by the Legislature, while he was not scrupulous how he gained the influence. We mention this to induce our readers to consider how far Church and State seemed ostensibly to co-operate, and how far in times past the sanction of the Church was always given in spiritual matters. The *apparently* scrupulous manner in which Henry VIII. acted in regard to the Parliamentary Convocation and Provincial Synod shows what the feeling was, in regard to the interference of the State in Church matters. Where there was anything wrong mixed up with the proceedings at the Reformation it does not follow that it must be right, and be taken as a precedent in the present day because the Legislature sanctioned it and no steps have been taken to reverse their acts. In the present day the connection between Parliament and Convocation seems to be little understood; hence the schemes afloat for the reform of Convocation, as it is termed. It would be well to consider whether the reform in Convocation put forth by so many clergy as well as laity might not lead to a revolution in regard to the whole constitution of our country. There is little hope of benefit from the admission of laity into Convocation, when we remember how much hostility to the Church of England has increased since laity of all religious persuasions have been admitted into the House of Commons. How far the admission of laity into Convocation can be sanctioned without interfering with the previous arrangements and understanding that has subsisted with the Lower House of Parliament is a question which would require considerable attention. As the clergy have waived the privilege of taxing themselves they now have a voice in sending members to the Commons to represent their interest. With respect to any measures affecting the temporalities of the Church they have no occasion for laity among them, since their measures have to pass the Lords and Commons.

Even by the Act called the Act of Submission [25. Hen. VIII. c. 19] A.D. 1533, there is nothing giving the laity any power in enacting canons. The Sovereign has the power of silencing the deliberations of Convocation, but it does not countenance any interference of Parliament. Convocation is by this Act responsible to the King alone. The opinion and votes of the laity are not wanted in the Provincial Synod nor in the Diocesan Synod if revived. If the laity have anything to say in regard to the parochial and temporal arrangements in their respective parishes it might be attended to by the churchwardens and sidesmen (*i.e.* Synodsmen) at

the Archdeacon's visitation. The present form of archidiaconal visitation has sprung out of the Archidiaconal Synod. In this way something might be done towards restoring the ancient practices of the Church without attempting measures likely to revolutionise the whole constitution in Church and State. The great difficulty has been in all ages in adjusting the balance between Church and State. This can only be done when "kings become nursing fathers" and "queens nursing mothers" to the Church. Kings and queens must be under the influence of the Holy Spirit, which is promised to the Church, before they are likely to rule, to the benefit of the State as well as the influence and extension of the Church. We find in different times in the course of eighteen centuries that the Church has had to struggle through many difficulties. Sometimes it has been oppressed by the State, at other times the State has acted in harmony with it. We hear at some periods that the Church has attempted to place itself above the State and to keep kings in subjection. These are events at which we need not be surprised so long as there is evil in the world. If we review the position of the Church of England, as we shall more particularly hereafter, we shall find that its connection with the State has exposed it to weal and woe,—the alternation of prosperity and adversity, but we cannot refrain from noticing the wonderful manner in which, through the providence of God, it has been preserved. It has been often cast down, but not destroyed.

It is a difficult matter to argue on Scriptural grounds with many who have been admitted into Parliament of late years. The confused ideas which prevail in regard to the Catholic Church have led many to imagine that Christianity is supposed to embrace all who choose to call themselves Christians. The Christian religion has gained a certain influence in this country. Many are Christians in profession without living daily under its gracious influence. The risings of passion, ambition, selfishness, conceit and self-will have proceeded to very great lengths, and when these are not checked by the gracious influence of God's Spirit there is an easy procession to discord, confusion, opposition, schism, and even violence. It is generally thought that, so long as a person professes some religion, it matters not what that may be, provided he thinks it right. Many adopt such a course without troubling themselves to enquire what grounds there are to satisfy themselves that they are right. Very often interest, temper, conceit, self-sufficiency and anxiety to appear a leading man in a society induce people to desert

that form of religion which requires its followers to submit to self-denial, mortification, and the renunciation of self-will. A religion which teaches people to do what they think is right according to their own consciences is most palatable, and this course is adopted without considering that conscience may be seared, ignorant and blinded by prejudice. This is the case when man neglects proper attention to the Word of God and neglects informing himself properly in divine things. I notice this because there is much in it that leads to a renunciation of everything that has an appearance of tests. Doing away with tests under the expectation that more might be induced to conform is a vain project. Bishop Horsley has said, with keen discernment, "Should the test laws be now repealed *Dissenters will be Dissenters still.*" What objection can there be to tests on admission into any society or employment? Little need be said against tests in religious matters when in the daily experience of the commercial and mercantile world assurances are given for the faithful discharge of engagements. Before a clerk is engaged in any monetary or commercial establishment assurance is required of the faithful, diligent and honest discharge of the duties that may be required of him. If then the religion of Jesus Christ is better calculated than any other to insure the faithful discharge of duty between man and man, surely an open profession and attachment to the principles and duties of his religion, is the least we may require to satisfy us that he is likely to be honest and faithful in attending to the business assigned him. It is the duty of every one arrived at years of discretion who calls himself a Christian to be a frequenter at the Holy Communion. When a person is anxious to avail himself of the Christian privileges and obey the commands of his Saviour, we may reasonably expect him to be faithful to his temporal trust, and discharge the duties of his office to the satisfaction of those who employ him. But what can we expect of a man not availing himself of his Christian privileges and living in the neglect of those public, private, and domestic duties which are characteristic of the Christian believer? Much clamour was raised a few years back against those in public offices of the State being required to be communicants of the Church of England. Some, it was said, were induced to receive the Holy Communion unworthily, and therefore it would be better they should not receive it than be guilty of such profanity. But where was the fault? certainly not in the civil magistrate, who did the best he could to secure faithful and honest men such as were likely to manage the

public affairs with fairness and uprightness, and in doing so he tried to secure Christian men, who were under more stringent principles than the infidel who had little beyond his own present interest to guide him, or the schismatic who disregarded order and regularity in all his proceedings, independently of erroneous views of Christian doctrine and duties. If any approach the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper with profaneness or unfitness, the fault does not rest with the magistrate, who cannot possibly see into the hearts of men. All he can do is to satisfy himself of the sincerity of the person by an act of the Christian religion as an evidence of his religion. It is optional on the part of the candidate. There is nothing to oblige him to do so. If there should be a command to partake unworthily the civil magistrate would be partaker of his guilt. All that the civil magistrate did was to see that Christian men were entrusted with offices of importance to the State, as the most likely to be faithful and honest. Now if individuals should openly confess by solemn acts what they otherwise deny and disregard, the fault is their own. The requirement of the magistrate does not make the person receive unworthily any more than the command of the Author of the Christian religion. The requirement of the magistrate is not absolute but conditional. If a person accepts the conditions without any sincere desire to fulfil them, he certainly is not likely to discharge with satisfaction other duties required of him. No one was ever obliged to receive the Lord's Supper; it was optional on his part although he could not hold certain responsible situations without doing so. The civil magistrate can only judge of a man's fitness by his outward act. Every one who calls himself a Christian is bound to be a partaker of the Holy Communion, for every one who calls himself a Christian is expected to obey the Saviour's commands. Whoever, then, wishes others to be admitted to responsible offices without possessing the striking characteristic of the Christian profession, can have very little regard for the consistency of those men who are most prominent in the nation. In requiring some test there is nothing whatever opposed to toleration. We may require compliance with certain conditions from those we entrust with the management of our business, while we do not violate the toleration we grant to others by forcing on them that compliance. But I am aware that some say the case ought to be different in regard to civil and national offices, since there are people of different religious persuasions, and that we

all have a right to expect there should be regard to the consciences of all. If kings and rulers are really disciples of Christ Jesus they cannot conscientiously appoint people to situations of responsibility who share no desire to live godly in Christ Jesus, and repudiate the very Sacraments and ordinances of the Catholic Church which are considered essential to the impartation and increase of spiritual life. But an objection is raised by those who secede from the Church, to the effect that, no one form of religious profession should be favoured more than another. In reply, we can only say that all the various forms in which the Christian religion is professed should not be treated alike. It would be wrong and inconsistent with our holy religion to do so. We cannot suppose that all the variety of sects opposing and contradicting each other can be right. If not right, then they should not all be equally supported. There may be something in each which they in common believe, while there are many points in which they differ, and some of these points may affect the very foundation and essentials of our holy religion. There seems to be a prevalent opinion that every one should do what he thinks right in his own mind. What would be the state of a private family if the children and servants should disregard arrangements intended for the good order and well-being of the family, and each think he might act as he thought fit in defiance of the master and mistress of the house? If in some things toleration be granted, it is hardly fair and reasonable that those servants and children who have toleration in some things, should force their peculiar opinions and observances on the rest of the family. We may readily imagine how toleration is consistent with restraint. Now where there has not been proper restraint we invariably find that those who have had toleration have proceeded to overbearing, self-willed, and intolerant measures, denying to others what they claimed for themselves, and it is remarkable that the most intolerant ends are gained through a professed anxiety in effecting a reform under the pretext of religion. This was an ancient device. We may go as far back as the time of Moses and Aaron, when Korah, Dathan, and Abiram "rose up before Moses with certain of the children of Israel, two hundred and fifty princes of the assembly famous in the congregation, men of renown, and they gathered themselves together against Moses and against Aaron, and said unto them, Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among them.

Wherefore then lift ye up yourselves above the congregation of the Lord? And when Moses heard it he fell on his face" [Numbers xvi. 1—4]. The subsequent part of the Mosaic history informs us of the miserable end of these men for setting themselves in opposition to the constituted authorities of Church and State established by God himself. How was it with Absalom the rebellious son of David when he rose against his father? he put on the appearance of godliness. After he had prepared the way by stealing the hearts of the men of Israel "it came to pass that he said unto the King I pray thee, let me go and pay my vow, which I have vowed unto the Lord in Hebron. For thy servant vowed a vow while I abode at Geshur, in Syria, saying, If the Lord shall bring me again indeed to Jerusalem, then I shall serve the Lord. And the King said unto him: Go in peace. So he arose and went to Hebron. But Absalom sent spies throughout all the tribes of Israel, saying, As soon as ye hear the sound of the trumpet, then go and say, Absalom reigneth in Hebron [2 Samuel xv.]. We might illustrate our subject by reference to the Earl of Bothwell in Scotland, who, to gain his end, joined the Presbyterians, and acted with them against Popery [Cambden's Elizab.]. Mr. Baxter has observed, that the "appearance of more spirituality and strictness was that which drew Tertullian to the Montanists, and which promoted a great part of the heresies which have torn the Churches of Christ" [Baxter's Cath. Theol. Pref.]. It was in this way that Donatus and his followers in the fourth century kept up their separation from the Catholic Church; the Donatists, whom St. Augustine calls "Impios, et fastidiosos pertinaces et superbos separatores" [Augt., Ep. 48, 166, 171]. During the troublesome times of Charles I. religion was made a pretext to poison the people with anti-monarchical principles. To effect this purpose they placed schismatical lecturers in most towns and populous places throughout the kingdom [Dugdale]. King Charles I. said, "I have observed that the Devil of Rebellion doth commonly transform himself into an Angel of Reformation; and when men's consciences accuse them of sedition, or faction, they stop its mouth with the name and noise of religion and zeal" [Eikon Basilike xxvii.]. So it is in the present day: the clamour for reform in the Church of England is so mixed up with attempts at unconstitutional proceedings, that we can only conclude that the desire is to amalgamate with the various sects of religion, if not to extinguish the separate existence of the Church of England;

and this is attempted by those very persons to whom the Church has granted toleration, and striven to satisfy by removing, what was considered by them, grievance after grievance. For those who are not bound to worship God according to the forms and ritual of the Church of England, but have every latitude to worship God as they please, to interfere with those who wish to worship God as we do in the Church of England, is inconsistent with the principles of that toleration which they enjoy, and evinces the necessity of *some* restraint wherever liberty of conscience and toleration are enjoyed. The peace and good order of society ought not to be disturbed by those very persons who are enjoying such privileges. If the Church of England has attained an influential position in the elevation and enlargement of the public mind, and secured an influence for the promotion of the general welfare of the country, and, at the same time, allowed the more contracted and narrow-minded of the people to enjoy in peace and quietness their peculiar opinions on religious matters, there is no good reason why they should dictate, and attempt by legislative measures to bring down the elevated tone of thinking, and the spiritual services of our Church to a level with their system. Such action betokens want of charity, toleration, learning and regard for the feelings of others. Those must know little of human nature, as developed in profane and ecclesiastical history, who strive to produce an union of Dissenters with Churchmen. To meet the views of the various sects into which Protestantism is divided in this country, it would be necessary for the Church of England to give up so many of its essential doctrines and practices that the essentials of Christianity would be almost obliterated. Dissent in this country has not tended to promote unity so extensively as the Church of England. Even if Dissenters should outnumber the members of the Church of England (I am only arguing on the supposition), it is perfectly clear that unity has been promoted more extensively by that Church than by any or all the Dissenting sects put together. Into how many sects or parties opposed to, and differing from, each other are Dissenters divided? Even Methodists, who seem to hold together better than any other sects, are divided into several parties acting independently of each other; and as for Independents, there is no bond of union between the various congregations. If then the various sects into which religious profession is divided cannot be united, how is it likely that it will ever be cemented together by any compromise made by

the Church of England? It would be contrary to the principles of Christ's Church militant here upon earth, to give up even one essential doctrine or apostolic custom, to meet the views of those who dissent from her. There are some few points in which, perhaps, all or most may agree; but there are others equally as essential in which there is a great difference. Some would have us to be united on those points in which all agree, and say nothing about the rest. This is a course so utterly opposed to the spirit and plain precepts of Christianity, that, if indulged in, would lead ultimately to the extinction of Christianity, as far as human prudence and foresight are concerned, were there not promises of permanent existence to the Church of Christ, and an assurance that the Saviour would be with His Church to the end of the world. The late Dr. Arnold, a name much respected and of considerable weight, had some visionary theories respecting the Church. He seemed to wish that the Established Church should be open to men of every shade of opinion; and it seems the influence of his opinions has descended to less amiable and talented minds, and the result has led to greater discord in the Church, and interrupted that harmony and unity which should ever prevail. If we give up every apparent cause of difference and disagreement, and sacrifice important principles to conciliate separatists of every sort, we can expect nothing but a failure, provided we know anything of the difficulties and struggles of the Church in preceding ages. We are taught in the Bible ever to be observers of events that happen not only around us, but in every period of preceding history. Much instruction is imparted through the providential dealings of the Almighty towards individuals and nations. It would be better to allow the Church to take an independent position, irrespective of any connection with the State, than allow her to retain only such Articles of Faith and discipline as embrace the indefinite and lax generalities of religion. But what is to become of a nation that throws aside all profession of religion, and leaves every one to do what is right in his own eyes? If we are to take warning from history, we may fairly suppose that if one form of religion is put aside and brought down from its pre-eminence, there will be some struggle among the vast variety of sects to gain the countenance, if not support, of the ruling powers. The State will ever be subject to the petty struggles and intrigues of party influence. Thus Christianity will be exposed to the contempt of infidels and sceptics. What are we to believe? and where is the

true Church? will be their language, when there are such differences, opposition and contradiction among those who profess to be followers of Christ Jesus. The very principles of Dissent generate this state of things. Such jarring elements of discord can never be supposed to proceed from an Infinitely Wise and Almighty Being, who shows by His works that He is a God of order and not of confusion. If the Almighty has been so gracious as to reveal to sinful man a system of doctrines and duties calculated to elevate the soul of man above the influence of this lower world, He never would leave us in uncertainty in regard to that Body through which His gracious influences are imparted. There must be some characteristics whereby the professors of the truth are distinguished from the heterogeneous and jarring elements abroad in the world, and which they think possess claims of attention, and are tokens of submission. The clamour for union is a delusion which never can be dispelled while so many contradictory elements are in collision, and this will ever be the case while there is so much talk about a toleration without some restraint, and a liberty of conscience of which there is no assurance that it will be properly regulated.

If it be asked what right the Church of England has to put itself forth as having a stronger claim on the attention and affections of the nation than any of the many religious sects with which we are surrounded, we may briefly reply that the Church of England can produce proof of an existence and uninterrupted succession from the first dawn of Christianity. There seems to have been a remarkable providence over the Catholic Church, of which it is a part, notwithstanding the rise and fall of nations, while the various sects which are now in existence have had a very short existence, and cannot put forth their claims of antiquity either in regard to their peculiar doctrines, or existence as a body or corporation. The cause of their existence can be easily traced, and we shall find, on investigation, that the evil and troublesome passions of our nature were concerned in their origin. It seems strange, then, that if these numerous sects should have been so many hundred years without any recognized position as Churches, and their existence totally unknown, that any claim should be put forth to the attention of the people. Their existence seems to have sprung up on a sudden, without any connection or bond of union with the Founder of Christianity and His apostles. If they put forth their claim as part of the True Church on

the ground of possessing the true and saving doctrines of religion, we may ask, from whence did they derive their peculiar tenets, which are opposed to that inspired Book from which they may have derived some share of purity and correctness? Each sect may, perhaps, say there is an unity among themselves—which we very much doubt, when there is no visible bond of union—but they cannot say that this union not only extends among coeval societies, but also upwards, through succeeding generations, to the times of the apostles or first bishops of the Catholic Church, appointed by Christ Himself. The Church which possesses this mark certainly has the first claim of attention on the part of a nation. Previous to the ministry of our Blessed Saviour the Church of the Living God, through successive ages, always had a recognized existence in the world, and no self-constituted societies were ever allowed to set themselves up as possessing equal authority. There is one peculiar circumstance in the arrangements made by God Himself, under the Mosaic dispensation, which shows that unity is not, to be promoted by self-constituted officers. The arrangement for the succession of priests under the law was made by God Himself, through His servant Moses, and any interference with the duties of their office was visited by God's displeasure, as may be seen in the case of Korah and his companions, who said to Moses and Aaron, "Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among them; wherefore, then, lift ye up yourselves above the congregation of the Lord?" [Numb. xvi. 6.] Even King Saul did not usurp the priest's office without God's displeasure, when, having waited for Samuel a long time, he himself offered a burnt-offering, [1 Saml. xiii.], and pleaded the necessity of doing it; but, notwithstanding his excuse, to obey was evidently better than sacrifice. How was King Uzziah visited when "he went into the temple of the Lord to burn incense upon the altar of incense?" [2 Chron. xxvi.] When Azariah the priest went in after him and with him fourscore priests of the Lord, that were valiant men; and they withstood Uzziah the king, and said unto him, It appertaineth not unto thee, Uzziah, to burn incense unto the Lord, but to the priests, the sons of Aaron, that are consecrated to burn incense! go out of the sanctuary, for thou hast trespassed! neither shall it be for thine honour from the Lord God. Then Uzziah was wroth and had a censer in his hand to burn incense, and while he was wroth with the priests the leprosy

even rose up in his forehead," . . . "and they thrust him out from thence: yea, himself hasted also to go out, because the Lord had smitten him. And Uzziah the king was a leper until the day of his death, and dwelt in a several house, being a leper." [2 Chron. xxvi. ; Lev. xiii. 46 ; Numb. v. 2.]

The history of Jeroboam is confirmatory of God's intention that those who are not called according to His law were not allowed to invade the priest's office, neither is it allowed kings, or others, to make or consecrate priests by their own authority. Jeroboam made "priests of the lowest of the people" which were not of the sons of Levi, "who-soever would he consecrated him, and he became one of the priests of the high places. And this thing became sin unto the house of Jeroboam, even to cut it off and to destroy it from off the face of the earth." [1 Kings xiii.] It would be contrary to the design of this work to enter extensively on this subject; we see clearly that the Church and State are separate corporations, and yet they may be united in promoting the designs of Almighty God, in regard both to the temporal and spiritual welfare of the nation. It is evident from the above, and other parts of Sacred Writ, that Church and State may co-operate without interfering with each other's peculiar province. But one thing is certain, that, when such people as Korah, Saul, Uzziah and Jeroboam presume to invade the priestly office there is to be determined resistance on the part of others belonging to the Church. There is to be no sacrifice of the Divine commands, and the sanctioned customs of the Church, to meet the views of an ignorant, thoughtless and self-willed multitude, and allaying their consciences. Peace is not to be sought at the sacrifice of truth. I am aware that much ignorance prevails in regard to the Mosaic law. There are very lax and indefinite notions in regard to the Mosaic law, entirely through ignorance and an indisposition to examine and compare the Sacred Writings. People are apt to forget that God never contradicts Himself—that there is a perfect harmony and consistency pervading the Sacred Writings, and nothing in them contradictory to the works of nature. Why is the Old Testament handed down to us but for our instruction? And if some things have been more fully developed we are not to disregard the dealings and plans of the Almighty in any period of the world. Without enlarging on this argument in reference to the constitution of the Church of God, suffice it for me to observe that there is enough in the New Testament to show

that the Saviour intended to hand down to posterity the means of grace and privileges of being His disciples through a body termed the Church, with which He promised to be to the end of the world. The appointment of the apostles, and the selection of one to fill up the place of Judas, as well as the instruction and directions in the several epistles, especially in those to Timothy and Titus, direct our thoughts to the constitution of a society or body of men, separated from the world, for the extension of the Redeemer's name. We hear a great deal about societies being formed to promote any temporal object, and when the object of the society is intended for future generations there is always a power invested in some to secure the appointment of proper officers. When such is the usual course of dealing in the common affairs of this life, why should it be thought unreasonable that a similar course should be adopted in regard to the spiritual and higher interest of man? We find that the apostles and their successors in the ministry followed up a similar plan, suggested by the plans and dealings of Almighty God in preceding ages, and adopted by the Saviour Himself. So careful has the Church of Christ been in subsequent ages that records have been kept of the successions of bishops in various churches. We have, in the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius, a work of undoubted antiquity, lists of the succession in several churches, besides incidental allusions* in many other writers of the earliest period. There is a remarkable circumstance confirmatory of the importance of the method adopted for handing down the scheme of Church government through the apostolic succession to distant ages. It is this, notwithstanding the many erroneous doctrines which started into existence in the Church, and the numerous synods and councils called together to put them down, the succession of ministry in the Church has never been questioned. Even heretics of the worst sort never appear to have disputed the method pursued by the Catholic Church; and, moreover, there always has seemed a desire to consider themselves within the pale of the Church. And so particular were the churches in the first few centuries that the succession in the ministry should be properly kept up, that precautions were taken at various synods or councils to secure ordinations according to the universally acknowledged rule of the Church. So careful were they that no mistake should arise likely to

* Clem. Rom. Ep., 42, 43. Irenaeus adv. Heres. lib. 3—3, 4; 4—26. Tertull de praescriptione haereticorum, 21, 32. Cyprian Ep. 3, 33, 38, 66—3, 69—4, 75—17.

invalidate Holy Orders that they were not content to allow ordination of a bishop to be given by ONE bishop in the apostolic ministry, but required *three* to take a part in the ordination, as if determined to make sure of one, at least, bearing testimony that there was security for the rule of succession being complied with. Besides, we find that letters of approval from bishops who could not be present were expected, as well as the consent of the metropolitan or primate.*

We shall notice some canons of the early Church, which show how careful they were in the second and third centuries to secure succession in the ministry of the Catholic Church. For this purpose we cannot do better than consult the canons of the Church passed at synods and councils which were held in different countries, and in some cases at a distance from each other. The canons of the Church give us a more correct idea of ecclesiastical history than almost anything else. In fact we cannot have a true knowledge of the Church if we neglect its internal proceedings. The apostolic canons come under our notice first as they are considered the most ancient; they are alluded to by several synods in the third and fourth centuries, particularly by that at Nice and Antioch, in which it is evident that the apostolic canons were previously passed. It does not appear that the apostolic canons were all passed at once in a single synod, in all probability they were passed at different times and at different assemblages of the clergy but were afterwards collected in one body. We can hardly suppose that the different churches that were so widely spread never consulted together for their common welfare during the two first centuries, for we find from the writings of the early Christians in this early period now extant that there was considerable communication. The late Bishop Beveridge has, with much industry, shown that many synods were held during the second and third centuries.

In the apostolic canons the first is "let a bishop be consecrated by two or three bishops."

At the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325, care is taken on the same point. Canon 4. "A bishop ought to be constituted by all the bishops that belong to the province; but if this be not practicable, either through pressing necessity or the length of the journey, three must by all means meet; and when they have the consent of those that are absent, signified by letter, then let them perform the consecration; and the ratification

* Apost. Canons, 1. Conc. Nicæa, Canon, 4. Conc. Antioch Canon, 19, 23. African Code, 13, 49, 50. Canons of Theophilus, Archbishop of Alexandria, 6.

of what is done must be allowed in each province to the metropolitan." So careful was the Church on this point that not more than sixteen years after the Council of Nice the synod at Antioch, A.D. 341, some distance from Nice, took care to attend to the same point with rather more stringent regulations. In Canon 19, "Let not a bishop be ordained without a synod and the presence of the metropolitan, who is to call all his brethren in the Liturgy to the metropolis by letter; and it is best that all meet; but if this be not practicable yet a majority at least ought to be present or to give their consent by letter, and then let the ordination be performed with the presence or suffrage of the majority; but if they proceed contrary to the decrees let the ordination be of no force; but if some contradict, out of an affectation of dispute, let the majority of voices prevail." In Canon 23 of the same synod it is enacted that "a bishop be made no otherwise than in a synod and by the judgment of the bishops who have power to promote a deserving man, when the former bishop is gone to rest." About 77 or 78 years after the last named synod the African Code was approved of at Carthage, A.D. 418—19, not that the African Church took no interest or showed no desire to keep discipline, for perhaps no church had met together so often, and passed so many canons, this is evident from the extensive code which ultimately was put forth and which has been received by both the Eastern and Western Churches. Canon 13, "according, to the statutes of old, let not any number of bishops presume to ordain another without the leave of the Primate; three may do with his leave. Canon 49, "That not less than three bishops ordain a bishop."

The number three was permitted, notwithstanding the general feeling that more bishops should be concerned in the ordination of a bishop, on account of some difficulty in assembling so many bishops at once in Africa, especially at Carthage, where ordinations seem more particularly to have taken place.

If we advert to the sixth question of Augustin and Pope Gregory's answer, A.D. 601, we shall observe how great care was taken that ordination of bishops should be properly attended to. It is unnecessary to notice the difference of MSS. and the seeming contradiction that has arisen. Whatever difficulty there might be then in Britain to secure a canonical ordination it is evident from Gregory's answer that care should be taken to secure the co-operation of a sufficient number of bishops.

"But we desire you, my brother, to ordain bishops in such a manner that they may not be at too great distance

from each other; that three or four may meet to ordain a bishop, for it ought not otherwise to be done."—*Bede. Eccl., Book I. c. 27.*

When Theodore succeeded to the Archbishoprick of Canterbury, A.D. 668, he soon took steps to increase the number of bishops. Previously we read of several being sent into France for ordination; there seemed to be an impression that particular care should be had in ordaining bishops, for when Theodore doubted the consecration of Chad *he completed it*, thus showing an importance attached to the ordination of a bishop, on which it was evident something materially depended; it is clear that a regularity was observed in the Christian Church in reference to the ordination of its ministers, and that all over Christendom, not only in England, but in all the Western and Eastern Churches. Why should the chain be so carefully continued without a broken link in the connection through so many hundred years in all the Churches, spread far and wide, without any doubt with respect to its necessity? So tenaciously was this observed that even heretics could not divest themselves of the validity of the custom; and so particular have all Churches been in recording the succession in the various Sees that the links of the chain may be found unbroken, not merely in the Eastern and Western Churches generally, but even in the English and Irish Branches of the Catholic Church. What better rule can we have for the information of our judgment in the choice of a Church on which our eternal interest depends? But how is it with those who take up with the profession of a religion which seems little more than the offspring of the age, except that it claims some indefinite connection with some of the truths of Christianity, without any evidence that those opinions have been handed down uninterruptedly from the Founder of the religion and His apostles to the present day? There is another material point which is much overlooked. It is this, that the various sects which profess to be followers of Jesus Christ totally discard some of the important truths which are essential for our spiritual welfare. It is too generally supposed that the Church is what we may choose to make it, provided we put some sort of indefinite trust in the Saviour. The lax notions which prevail among sects which have either separated from the Church of England directly, or from each other, cannot have so great a claim on the nation as that Church which has been transmitted from the apostles, who knew the mind of

the Saviour, and acted as nearly as they could in conformity with the directions He had given. We have the writings of some of the disciples of the apostles, and generations immediately following, with Christian writers in every age succeeding each other to the present day, all bearing testimony to those writings of the early Church which give the form of Church government, as well as the Christian doctrines which prevailed. Who can read the Ecclesiastical History, by Eusebius, and doubt the existence of Episcopal form of Church government, and the importance of the Church being a corporate body, with power to keep up the succession of those officers through whom the glad tidings of the grace of God were to be published, and with whom the Saviour had promised His presence. This is the Church which has an undoubted claim on the affections of Englishmen. It is not a Church of the age; it did not spring into existence when Presbyterians, Baptists, and other Nonconformists were the offspring of schism or heresy. The doctrines which these put forth could not be traced through preceding ages to the times of the apostles. Unity is not promoted through the principles of Dissent. What is there to promote unity in the principles of Independents, when there is no bond of union between the various congregations, and each congregation specifies its own terms or conditions to the pastor. Among all sects of Dissenters great stress is laid on the importance of preaching as the main reason why they should go to a place of worship. The various interpretations and explanations of the Word of God given by the preacher are generally received with undue deference. What authority there is for the often strange and contradictory explanations of the Bible, beyond the wild effusions of an ignorant and perhaps enthusiastic imagination, it is difficult to imagine. We hear a great deal said by the supporters of such a system for perpetuating ignorance against the interpretation of the Bible given by authorized and industrious men who lived soon after the apostles, as if those who lived and conversed, in many cases, with the disciples of the apostles, knew less than we can know of the Word of God. You might as well say that people of the present day know less of the true interpretation of Acts of Parliament and the events which are now taking place in the Church of England than those are likely to know who may live a hundred or two hundred years to come. What do we know of events that occurred three hundred years ago except through State documents and the writings of men handed down to us from that time?

View the matter in this light, and you will see the importance of attending to documents explanatory and illustrative of our faith, which were penned by men in holy intercourse and communion with those who received the information in its freshness, and before it had been polluted in after ages. The writings of the fathers of the earliest ages of the Christian Church are despised by too many of those who in many respects are well disposed, though ill-informed Christians. Surely, then, the crude, ill-digested handling of Sacred Scripture, put forth as suitable and proper food for the benefit of the higher and more elevated portion of man, is not to be accepted as more beneficial than what has been handed down from the purest source and preserved from the contamination of some eighteen hundred years, through the Providence of God, in furtherance of the Saviour's promises to the Church.

I have noticed somewhat of the claims of the Church of England on the particular attention of the nation, as more likely than any of the surrounding sects, to co-operate with the State, in promoting the welfare of the community at large; for there is this advantage: good order, unity, peace, the subjugation of self-will and conceited ignorance, are more likely to be promoted through the principles of that Episcopal Church which has been preserved by Divine Providence during the rise and fall of empires and kingdoms, and has retained its pre-eminent position when subject to the varied forms of civil government whether or not adopted as the national form of religion, rather than by any of the numerous sects which are ill-adapted to every sort of government, inasmuch as there is little in them to keep down insubordination and prevent schisms, which is essential in any well-regulated State. That care and attention were bestowed in securing the succession appears not only from the early Church historians, such as Eusebius, but also from writers in our own country. Bede, in the Preface to the first Book of his "*Eccles. Hist.*," says:—"What was done towards promoting the faith, and what was the sacerdotal succession in the province of Lindsey, we had either from the letters of the most Reverend Prelate, Cunebert, or by word of mouth from other persons of good credit." This was written previous to A.D. 734, the year in which Bede died, according to the Saxon chronicle.

The reason why so little has been said in the history of synods and ecclesiastical history generally, on the importance of succession in the Christian ministry is owing chiefly

to the fact not being questioned. The custom was acted upon and not disputed; it was a point admitted by the orthodox and heretics, and the lists of the succession preserved in various churches in Christendom is a testimony to the general opinion of the Church respecting its importance; besides, whenever a difficulty arose in securing a valid ordination they made certain of it by sending to a great distance, or to bishops canonically ordained to take a part in the ceremony. The controversy which took place in more recent days, A.D. 1559, in consequence of the ordination of Matthew Parker to the See of Canterbury, shows how much importance has been attached to the apostolic succession, which has never been questioned previous to the rise of the modern sects of Baptists, Presbyterians, and other Nonconformists of various sorts we cannot stay to mention. It appears from the practice, as well as the canons of the different branches of the Catholic Church, that no election and ordination of bishops could take place without the decision of the bishops and consent of the primate or metropolitan; but they were careful that the bishop was chosen in the presence of the people that they might have an opportunity of stating objections to his ordination, if they knew any, or stating anything they knew in his favour. "*Coram omni synagoga jubet Deus constitui sacerdotem id est instruit et ostendit, ordinationes sacerdotales non nisi sub populi assistentis conscientia fieri oportere, ut plebe præsente vel detegantur malorum crimina vel honorum merita prædicentur et sit ordinatio justa et legitima, quæ omnium, suffragio et indicio fuerit examinata.*"—*Cyprian*, Ep. 67—4.

"*Ut ad ordinationes rite celebrandas ad eam plebem, cui præpositus ordinatur, episcopi ejusdem provinciæ proximi quique conveniant et episcopus deligatur plebe præsente, quæ singulorum vitam plenissime novit et unius cuiusque actum de ejus conversatione perspexit.*"—*Cyprian*, Ep. 67—5.

From Cyprian it appears that the bishops made choice and not the people. The favourable opinion of the people might in some cases have weight. No doubt, previous to endowments, and while the emoluments of the Church depended on voluntary offerings, the people thought they had a right to recommend; but the people, in time, abused the consideration the bishops showed in choosing the clergy openly and in the presence of the people. We have many instances of the tumult and riots on the part of the people. It is enough merely to allude to some instances. The choice of Eusebius to be Bishop of Cæsarea, as related by Greg.

Nazianz, Orat. 18. The deposition of Eustathius, and the election of his successor, as related by Eusebius, E. H., Lib. I. c. 24. When Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria, was deposed by the Council of Chalcedon, and Proterius put in his place, there was a sedition as related by Evagrius, Lib. III. c. 7, 8.

We must not omit the dissension in the Church of Milan after the death of Auxentius, the Arian Bishop.—*Ruffinus*, Lib. II. c. 11.

We find the emperor or the civil power was often obliged to interfere when riot and sedition took place, and in many cases succeeded in calming the uproar. This led to the emperor, in some cases, recommending a candidate, but when he did so it was in full persuasion that the approval of the bishops in synod was requisite. This was the case when John (Chrysostom) was elected to Constantinople. Notwithstanding the voice of the clergy and people, the emperor, who approved of their wish, called a council, that the rules of the Church might be complied with.—*Sozomen*, Lib. VIII. c. 2.

The Church, in after ages, retained its pre-eminent position, although, in many cases, the influence of kings and emperors in some measure prevailed.

We have considered, chiefly, the claims of the Church of England as a National Church above those of the various sects with which this country abounds. It is, however, contended that no one form of religion should be professed above another by the State. This is rather a difficult matter so to arrange unless the king, and those who hold offices of government under him, have no religion whatever, which is more than we can expect. Wherever there is anything of Christianity—in whatever of its multitudinous and schismatical forms it may be professed—there is a desire that others should be brought to the same way of thinking, and this would lead to partiality to one form in preference to another, and no doubt patronage would be exercised accordingly. We should then have a similar clamour to what we now have against a particular form of religion being preferred. If the clamour should succeed against the Church of England, we might expect a scramble for supremacy among the motley sects which prevail in this land, where toleration and liberty of conscience have so extensively prevailed. What religion would such people expect our Queen to adopt? I have little doubt they would all strive to seek her conversion to their peculiar views, and if she decided in her choice there would be, I have no doubt, disappointment if not dissatisfaction

that might lead restless spirits to insubordination. I do not think Dissenters have ever definitively said what they mean by separation of Church and State. It is a common opinion among them that the clergy are paid by the State—an error which hardly needs more than a bare contradiction in these pages. Under this erroneous impression they seek the confiscation, or perhaps in some cases a division, of the revenues of the Church of England among the several sects, and that the clergy should be thrown on the voluntary system, without recollecting that the endowments of the Church of England were voluntary. If out of voluntary contributions, given some years ago, it had been thought more prudent to store them up to secure a permanent provision, it is no more than what the advocates of the voluntary system in many cases now practice when their collections exceed the present and temporary expenses. Would it be fair in either case, and consistent with the rights of property to lay hold of their accumulated funds and dispose of them contrary to their intentions? How inconsistent when Dissenters clamour to be relieved as they have already done, of what they consider grievances, and yet struggle to interfere with the internal arrangements of a Church which has done what it could to relieve their consciences. If there be need of reform in the Church of England why not leave its own members to see to it? If any disadvantages arise from abuses they can only affect its members. It matters nothing to Dissenters whether the clergy receive their support from endowments or voluntary contributions annually collected. There must be some motive for meddling and interfering with the funds of a Church with which they ignore all connection. What their motives may be time may disclose. We can hardly suppose they can be so infatuated as to expect that on disestablishment of the Church of England they may come in for a share of its revenues towards defraying the expenses of their meeting-houses. Some may, perhaps, think it would be convenient to secure the use of the parish churches, and that if the ministry in the Church of England should be filled with men of inferior education there would be less influential competition to contend with. Cases are continually occurring where the younger members of rigid Dissenters strive to raise themselves in their social position by emerging out of the society which does not hold out the least inducement to ambition in a social point of view. The sons of Methodists have in many cases sought ordination in the Church of England. Among so many

uneducated and ignorant individuals who take a prominent part in public affairs, there may be some who entertain impracticable ideas of the transfer of property. Even suppose the State had made a pecuniary grant, with the consent of Parliament, towards the Established Church, this would not give the right of taking the money back again at a future day; it would be like making a present and asking for it again. The voluntary system, which the enemies of the Church of England would compel it to adopt, is never likely to secure a ministry independent of unworthy influence in the discharge of its duties; when a clergyman, whose livelihood does not depend on the caprice of his hearers, rebukes the errors and vices of those around him, you may fairly give him credit for sincerity, and an anxious desire to discharge the duties of his office faithfully. This reminds me of some other things, which, if altered, might, in the opinion of some, meet a feeling in regard to Church patronage which some are anxious to indulge. There is a desire that the election of incumbents should be in the hands of the parishioners, instead of the lord of the manor, or owner of the advowson. If such a step should be taken, we might very shortly find, especially in country parishes, that the patronage of the Church would virtually be in the hands of a single individual: for instance, if the appointment of a clergyman depended on the majority of the householders, in time one wealthy individual might, perhaps, purchase above half of the land and houses, and secure the votes of the occupiers for the candidate he may choose to name. Again, two or three of the largest landed proprietors thus might secure to themselves the patronage, and agree among themselves how to dispose of it; perhaps, in some cases, each take it alternately. There are some unprincipled enough to clamour for popular election to livings that they might, through influence which property gives them in the parish, in effect, transfer the patronage into their own hands.* We

* The following are deserving attention in the present day. Justinian (A.D. 365) decreed: "Si quis oratorii domum fabricaverit, et voluerit in ea clericos ordinare aut ipse aut ejus hæredes; si expensas ipsis clericis ministrant et dignos denominant, denominatos ordinari. Si vero qui ab eis eliguntur tanquam indignos prohibent sacræ regulæ ordinari, tunc sanctissimus episcopus quoscunque putaverit meliores ordinari procuret."—*Justinian Constit.*, Novell CXXIII., c. 18.

The following is a canon made at the Council of Toledo, about A.D. 655:—"Pia compassione decernimus, ut quamdiu earundem fundatores ecclesiarum in hac vita superstitibus extiterint, pro eis dem locis curam permittantur habere sollicitam et sollicitudinem ferre præcipuam, at que rectores idoneos in iisdem basilicis iidem ipsi offerant episcopis ordinandos. Quod si tales forsan non

fear self-interest influences some who call themselves Churchmen to sanction the discontinuance of rates or charges on their property, that the removal of liabilities may afford a pretext for the advancement of rent, or, if the property is on sale, to secure a greater price. We have noticed these matters as they are so mixed up with the motives and course of procedure in reference to the Church. As it was at the Reformation, private interest induced some to consent to irregularities, and even plunder, to gain an advantage to themselves. There are many, no doubt, most liberally disposed in every way towards supporting the Established Church in this kingdom, but what are they among such a variety of sects, and so many others, irreligious sceptics and infidels, towards an adequate support of a national Church.

When it has pleased Providence to put into the hearts of so many of our forefathers to provide for the permanent support of the house of God and its services, it is like a rejection of His bounteous goodness, and tempting His Providence to reject His mercies, and cast ourselves on the liberality of man. The voluntary system may seem at first sight foreign to our subject, but after mature consideration it must appear to be a powerful leverage employed to overthrow the Church of England, and so plausible does it seem to a mind unacquainted with the world and its deceitful workings, that it is advocated by some apparently friendly to the support of the Church of England. How has the voluntary system answered among Dissenters? It may seem in some populous districts to answer; but what has it done in the retired and thinly-populated districts? If they occasionally have meeting-houses and services in such districts it is done by providing the people with a ministry wrapt up in ignorance and self-conceit—in fact, Dissent has neglected our country villages where the people cannot raise adequate means for schools and places of worship. If our forefathers had not built churches and provided for their

inveniantur ab eis, tunc quos episcopus loci probaverit Deo placitos sacris cultibus instituat, cum eorum conniventia servituros. Quod si spretis eisdem fundatoribus, rectores ibidem præsumpserit episcopus ordinare, et ordinationem suam irritam noverit esse et ad verecundiam sui alios in eorum loco quos iidem ipsi fundatores condignos elegerint ordinari.—*Concil.*, Tolet IX., Can. II., Labbe, Tom. 7.

The foregoing extracts from Justinian, and a canon of the Council of Toledo, show that those who founded and endowed churches had the nomination of the clergymen, if they choose such as were not prohibited by the canons; but if the bishop should refuse the nomination of the founders without just cause, and fill up the church, his (*i.e.*, the bishop's) appointment should be void, and, "to his shame, others appointed."

support, many hundreds of parishes might in all probability have been to this day without the house for Common Prayer and the administration of those Sacraments which are so essential to the faithful discharge of the ministerial offices. The cry for disestablishment implies nothing less than disendowment. It would not answer the purposes of the combined army of sects, infidels, and sceptics, to have disestablishment without disendowment. The Catholic Church is not without Divine promises of support far beyond any support that man may afford, but those promises do not necessarily imply temporal support. The Church of Christ may exist in a dejected and down-cast condition; it may be cast down through want of temporal support, yet not destroyed. It may be without having kings for nursing fathers and queens for nursing mothers, and yet retain its position as a light in the midst of surrounding darkness. But if kings and queens give it their fostering care, surely in the Providence of God it must be a great blessing.

If a nation rejects or casts off its subjection to the Saviour Jesus Christ how can it expect to prosper? We must then expect the candlestick to be removed, and be left like some other Churches recorded in history, without even a name to live. Divine Providence has put temporal means within our power. If we neglect or alienate them for secular, or even schismatical or heretical purposes, we cannot expect God's blessing on our projects.

England has extended its power and influence into every quarter of the globe, and has been instrumental in communicating the Gospel of the grace of God to thousands who previously were living in darkness and superstition, and many of them in uncivilized and savage life. Shall a nation that has been so highly prosperous in temporal success, and so successful in planting so many churches in the most distant corners of the globe, cast aside the spiritual blessings it has at home as things not worth retaining, or shall this nation consent to divide the means of its usefulness amongst those who reject the Church's influence and blessing for the sake of idols of their own vain imaginations, and which are only calculated to foster pride, self-conceit, intolerance, and want of charity? Without expatiating on the impracticability of the voluntary system answering a beneficial purpose so far as supplying a poor district with religious instruction, I will merely notice the case of Oberlin, whose indefatigable exertions *were, perhaps, never exceeded in behalf of the flock over whom he presided.* If the voluntary system

did not succeed in his case, it is difficult to say where it could.

“At the Revolution, Oberlin, like the rest of the established clergy of France, was deprived of his scanty income. This was in 1789. *At first* his parishioners came forward with *generous alacrity*, and declared that their *excellent* minister should be none the worse; that they would raise 1,400 francs (or about £56) a-year for him, at the least. The first year they subscribed a purse of 1,133 francs; the second year their liberality *fell down* to 400 francs (£16). The pastor saw how things were going on, and requested that there might be no more annual collections for him; he was unwilling to appear to be drawing from the poor or the reluctant; he would leave it entirely to their free-will and unsolicited offerings; they knew the way to his house, he said, and might bring to him what and when they pleased. In 1794, few as were Oberlin’s wants, his own resources, and his parishioners’ bounty had so far failed him, that he was obliged to undertake the charge of ten or twelve pupils for his subsistence.”*

This simple narrative cannot fail conveying one decided impression to the mind of those who know what human nature is when uninfluenced from above. We have seen something of the above spirit in our own country since the Act 31 and 32, Vic. c. 109, regulating or altering the compulsory payment of Church Rates. In too many parishes, we fear, the voluntary payment of Church Rates has given place to the total rejection, even where there are an adequate number of owners or occupiers whose circumstances fully justify their payment of what they had been accustomed to give for the expenses of divine worship, and keeping the church clean and in good repair. We are aware that the offertory has been substituted in some parishes, and in large and populous parishes it may seem to answer for awhile. Time will show how it will. There are too many who are only glad to have the opportunity of reducing their payments, and some such often looked upon as good churchgoers. With a view of inducing such to be more liberal in their support the importance of the laity in taking a part in Church Synods and in Convocation has been advocated. The churchwarden and sidesmen (synodsmen) might represent the parishes in the Archidiaconal Synod on parish arrangements and temporalities, while Diocesan Synods and

* Dr. Gilly.

Provincial Synods might be held and the Convocation retain its proper place in the Constitution without the admission of laymen.

The reform of Convocation, as some would have it, might disturb the present Parliamentary arrangements of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and the Commons. When once the Constitution is interfered with there is no knowing where it may end. The great difficulty is in so adjusting matters as to prevent Church and State from unduly interfering with each other. This can only be done through proper religious influence pervading the executive members of each body. We know from past history that many struggles for power and influence have taken place. Sometimes the struggle has been between the different orders of clergy among themselves, at other times the Bishop of Rome has sought the obeisance of kings and caused a collision between Church and State. When the State has been oppressed through the influence of a foreign power over the clergy, it has been obliged to take decisive steps to keep the Church in proper control. Under these circumstances we need not wonder that the Church has been kept in some things somewhat in restraint by the State, and that the discipline of the Church has been hindered. These few hints may throw light on some parts of our ecclesiastical history. As Convocation is so connected with the State, it may be as well briefly to notice some points which are too often misunderstood, in taking a proper view of the connection between Church and State. The Lower House of Convocation is no estate of the realm distinct from the Commons. The assembling of Convocation is for civil, not ecclesiastical purposes. Proper ecclesiastical councils rarely met in Parliament time. The consent of the inferior clergy was not expected in Provincial Synods. The *Praemunientes* clause might bring them to Parliament, but not to constitute a synod. The Privileges of 8 Henry VI., c. 1, were not for Provincial Synods, but Parliamentary Convocation. *Gravamina Cleri* were not in Synods, but in Parliament. Kings could forbid illegal acting of synods, but not the meeting. The Act of Submission, however, transferred the power of convening Provincial Synods to the king. The lower clergy and laity originally met in the diocese and archdeaconry. The clergy taxed themselves till 15 Carol. II., A.D. 1663. The power of negative on the Lower House grew out of its civil character, for civil property could not be disposed of but by their consent. The above few facts connected with

the history of Convocation may direct the thoughts in considering the subject of Church and State. More than what I have said would be foreign to the object of this work. The attacks made of late years against the alliance of Church and State seem to make the temporalities of the Church the main object of assault. Without entering upon the religious question any further, we may say it is asserted by some that all religious professions in the kingdom should be treated alike—that no one should be preferred before the rest, and, consequently that the highest civil magistrates should not have it in their power to grant temporal favours to one more than another. We can hardly imagine such a state of things to exist among kings and civil magistrates in a civilized country like England, unless there be a deadness, scepticism, and infidelity, in regard to all religious obligation. There would be a worse state of things in this respect than we find even among savages. Even in the flourishing and most civilised periods of Greece and Rome, when heathenism and idolatry prevailed, they still acted on the principle that the State must openly profess some religion, and it was this conviction, however much mixed with error, that caused them to resist the influence of Christianity, which struck at the root of their national belief and interfered with the national religion. What! is England, with all its religious advantages to become so stolid and insensible to religion as to cast aside its profession of national dependence on the only true and living God?

Such must be the point aimed at by those who seek to separate the State from all public profession of religion, or else there can be no other object in their attacks, than by causing disputes and divisions, for some one of the sects to step in and take its place. We have seen enough of this in the history of our own Church, to incline us to the opinion that, if the present Episcopal Church be separated from its connection with the State, some sect will take its place. But how can things come to such a pass unless the Queen gives her approval to such a measure, or the scenes of the Commonwealth be acted over again? If the Crown should accede to such a step it could only be to satisfy the urgent demands of the nation; but we hope for a better state of things, and that there will be no interference with the liberty of conscience, which the Crown of this country should possess in conformity with the Coronation Oath, which is an evidence what the sense of the State has been for generations in regard to the choice of the particular form

of religion most conducive to the public welfare and the glory of God. As we have already seen, TOO GREAT regard to the feelings of others and reluctance to coercion and persecution in matters of religion, led to the introduction and spread of those opinions which ultimately were so disastrous to the nation, we have reason to support that religious discipline which has conduced most to the security of the Articles of our Faith and the quiet and peaceable condition of the kingdom. Besides, there is great reason to discourage those numerous sects which reject the open profession of a Creed or even a summary of the Articles of the Christian Faith, beyond those vague and indefinite generalities which anyone may optionally express. The Church of England, as well as other Catholic Churches, has retained the true faith through the constant use of the three Creeds which are in the Book of Common Prayer. The faith and duty of its members are regularly brought before them in the use of the Creed, Lord's Prayer and Ten Commandments—a course of instruction ignored by most, if not all, sects that have dissented from her. The Lord's Prayer may be privately taught to some of their children, while the Creed is neglected on the ground that there is no occasion for it while they have the Bible, and as for the Ten Commandments, the sum and substance of their duty, they are left in total ignorance of them, unless they by chance have stumbled on the 20th Chapter of Exodus. Such a course of Christian instruction is never likely to secure attention to duty both to God and man.

It has been alleged that the religion of the people should not depend on the pleasure of their rulers. It cannot be said that this is the case through the alliance between Church and State in England. It is quite the reverse, for the State has already imposed on the Crown the form of religion which was most conducive to the temporal and spiritual welfare of the nation. The proceedings at the Coronation show that such is the case, while the pledge given by the Crowned Head assures us of support to the Church of England. The connection between Church and State has secured that toleration for Dissenters which they were never likely to have secured had not the King, Henry VIII., with all his faults and irregular measures, taken decisive steps to free the nation from temporal as well as spiritual slavery. Dissenters forget that the toleration they enjoy has, through the Providence of God, been the result of connection between Church and State. While

the Almighty Ruler of the Universe overruled the wrath of man, so that it redounded to His praise, He at the same time restrained the remainder of wrath. We are aware that some circumstances connected with the Reformation are much to be regretted, but these were not the necessary result of connection between Church and State. Indeed, a beneficial influence may be the result of the union. If the State should attempt any illiberal, intolerant measures, there is more likely to be a milder influence, softening down asperity. If the Church is not imbued with the spirit of purity, charity, brotherly love, and at the same time is not an example of what is pure and lovely and of good report, where are we likely to find these qualities which are so essential to bind together the various members of the community in unity, peace and concord?

I am aware that an answer to these remarks is given, to the effect that, those who do not belong to that branch of the Holy Catholic Church established in this kingdom may possess the amiable conciliatory qualities we have just noticed; if they should be so highly favoured it cannot be the result of the teaching which they have had, nor of the principles peculiar to the sect to which they profess to belong. The very act of schism shows a disposition to insubordination, and want of that Christian charity which is anxious to extend to others that toleration and liberty of conscience which has been granted to them, through that Church which they often stigmatise as bigoted and illiberal.

It may be as well to remind our readers of the nature and extent of the power of the civil magistrate as given in the 37th Article of our Church.

“The Queen’s Majesty hath the chief power in this realm of England and other her dominions, unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction.” The next words of the Article explain how far the power extends. The extent is not to go beyond the limits of civil power, though it may extend to persons and causes ecclesiastical. Princes are not to interfere with the ministering either of God’s Word or of the Sacraments. On these points it can hardly be supposed that Her Majesty has power to give judgment affecting the interpretation of Scripture, when Princes are not allowed to minister God’s Word. Where can we draw the distinction between ministering God’s Word and giving judgment on doctrinal points?

The Article is sufficiently explicit in defining the extent of the power of the Sovereign unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm doth appertain. The Article thus proceeds:—"Where we attribute to the Queen's Majesty the chief government (by which titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended), we give not to our Princes the ministering either of God's Word or of the Sacraments, the which thing the injunctions, also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen, do most plainly testify."

We are here referred to the injunctions set forth by Queen Elizabeth for further explanation of the limitation of that power.

In the admonition annexed to Queen Elizabeth's injunctions, A.D. 1559 (Sparrow's Collection), it is said:—"And, further, Her Majesty forbiddeth all manner of her subjects to give ear or credit to such perverse and malicious persons, which most sinisterly and maliciously labour to notify to her loving subjects how, by the words of the same oath (viz. of Supremacy), it may be collected the kings or queens of this realm, possessors of the crown may challenge authority and power of ministry of divine offices in the Church; wherein her said subjects are much abused by such evil disposed persons. For certainly Her Majesty neither doth nor ever will challenge any other authority than that was challenged and lately used by the said noble kings of famous memory, King Henry VIII. and King Edward VI., which is and was of ancient time due to the imperial crown of this realm; that is under God, to have the sovereignty and rule over all persons born within these her realms, dominions and countries of what estate, either ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they be, so as no foreign power shall or ought to have any superiority over them." To confirm the above as the sense put on the Oath of Supremacy there was a provision established by Act of Parliament to this effect:—"Provided also that the oath expressed in the same Act made in the first year shall be taken and expounded in such form as is set forth in an admonition annexed to the Queen's Majesty's injunctions, published in the first year of Her Majesty's reign; that is to say, to confess and acknowledge in Her Majesty, her heirs and successors, none other authority than that was challenged and lately used by the noble King Henry VIII. and King Edward VI. as in the said admonition may more plainly appear."*

The 37th Article goes on to say that we give "that only

* Stat. of 5 Elizab. cap. 1.

prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in holy scripture by God himself; that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil doers."

The peace and good order of the State seems to be implied by the words "restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil doers." There is to be no standing out against lawful authority in a State whether under the pretence of religion or otherwise.

If differences of opinion should prevail it is enough to have toleration without being allowed to disturb the peace of the community and interfering with the liberty of others. To use the words of King James himself, the king's supremacy is to "make decorum to be observed in all indifferent things," he goes on to say it implies a power to command "obedience to be given to the Word of God, by reforming religion according to his prescribed will, by assisting the spiritual power with his temporal sword, by the reformation of corruption, by procuring due obedience to the Church, by judging and cutting off all frivolous questions and schisms, as Constantine did, and finally by making decorum to be observed in all indifferent things for that purpose," which is the only intent of the Oath of Supremacy*.

It is but reasonable that all in a State should be subject to the jurisdiction of their sovereign. If there should be two or more supreme powers in a nation independent of each other we might have nothing but confusion, the laws of the one might be violated by observance of the laws of another, there would be no one to adjudicate. The differences and matters would terminate in one party striving to be supreme over another. If any were exempt from the jurisdiction of the sovereign they would no longer continue to be subject, which would create disorder and confusion in the State. This was found to be the case when the Bishop of Rome exercised a supremacy which interfered with the jurisdiction of the sovereign in all ecclesiastical and civil causes which did not interfere with "the ministering either of God's word or of the Sacraments."

It is hardly necessary to give any lengthened exposition of those passages of Sacred Scripture which support the connection of Church and State. There are so many sceptics and infidels, besides others who entertain low views of the Word of God, that any minute exposition would not have

* King James's Apology, p. 284 of his works.

the desired effect. Not a few have erroneous views of the Old Testament, and imagine that as the Gospel has superseded the Law, we have little to learn from the Old Testament. To attempt to convince such of their mistake on Scriptural grounds would take more space than the limits of this work would allow. However, I would bring before their notice some facts as briefly as possible, that those more impartially disposed and less prejudiced may have some proofs for reflection. It is asserted in this liberal age that kings or civil magistrates, and priests, have no business to interfere with each other's particular avocation. This is a very convenient opinion to attempt to establish, and through it to induce people to relax in their endeavours for a righteous cause. The clergy, it is continually proclaimed, ought not to interfere in any civil or political contest. And why? Under the plea that as their parishioners entertain different views on those subjects, they should avoid giving offence. Have not the clergy civil rights to support? Why should they be debarred the privileges of other people? If an unfair, un-Christian measure should be attempted why should God's ministers cease proclaiming against impiety, unfairness, and ungodliness? When the honour of God is likely to be sacrificed by legislative measures, through the influence of individuals who know and care little about Christianity, surely the exertions and influence of Christ's ministers are not to be laid aside lest they give offence to some who might, as too many erroneously think, be won by conciliatory means. Such motives are unworthy of the Christian name when any doctrine decidedly erroneous is sought to be established. The example of Christ's minister in consistency with his preaching has more weight than any other course. It is to prevent the proper regulation and conduct of temporal and civil affairs through the influence of the ministerial character that so much is said against the clergy taking an active part in State affairs. It is that the influence of the Church of England may be lessened, and political aspirants given to Scepticism, Infidelity, and Republicanism may gain the upper hand, that some want the removal of the bishops from the House of Lords. All this is done under the mask of religion, and on that account urged with greater earnestness when every one rightly influenced knows that if proper and true Christian motives influenced their conduct they would feel truly thankful that the legislature should be influenced by men of Christian temper and experience, in the various civil

departments. A superficial view of the clamour on this point cannot fail disclosing the party, and selfish schemes, which prompt such unreasonable and anti-Scriptural maxims. Church and State are distinct bodies, but it does not follow that they are to act irrespective of each other. Those who take the Bible as their guide in all the relations of private, domestic, and civil life, cannot disregard the prophetic annunciations that "kings should be nursing fathers and queens nursing mothers" to the Church of Christ. To such we would briefly suggest a few portions of God's Holy Word for private consideration and meditation. We shall first notice some striking circumstances in the Old Testament which show that the connection of Church and State was not displeasing, but otherwise, to Almighty God, who is pleased with His people in whatever capacity they are placed when they forward His designs in bringing nations, kingdoms, and empires under the influence of that Church to which He has promised His presence.

When the people were so clamorous as to induce Aaron to consent to their making a golden calf, and yielding to their impatience, Moses the Lawgiver interferes, and Aaron the High Priest submits, to his authority, "Aaron said, Let not the anger of my Lord wax hot, thou knowest the people, that they are set on mischief." [Exod. XXXII. 2.] Among the laws put forth by the Lord God, was one giving power to the civil authorities to put to death a prophet enticing to idolatry. [Deut. XIII. 5.]

When Samuel had occasion to reprove Saul for disregarding the commandment of the Lord in regard to the spoils of the Amalakites, he, at the same time, acknowledged that Saul had civil authority over all the tribes without exception; he said that, "he was made the head of the tribes of Israel," there was no exception in favour of the tribe of Levi, which was appointed to carry out the arrangements for the services of religion. [1 Sam. XV. 17.]

We find that when Doeg accused Abimelech before Saul, the high priest appeared before him to answer the charges without questioning his authority. [1 Sam. XXII. 14.]

Abiathar submitted to the jurisdiction and judgment of King Solomon, [1 Kings, II. 26.] King David was not considered as acting contrary to his civil capacity when he made arrangements about sacred things, such as regulating the courses of the priests, and their attendance at public worship; [1 Chron. XXIII. 6.] and at his death he informed Solomon, his son, that, "the courses of the priests

and Levites should be with him for all the service of the house of God, and the princes and all the people should be wholly at his commandment." [1 Chron. XXVIII. 21.] In compliance with his father (David's) directions, Solomon "appointed, according to the order of David his father, the courses of the priests to their service, and the Levites to their charges, to praise and minister before the priests as the duty of every day required; the porters also by their courses at every gate, for so had David the men of God commanded, and they departed not from the commandment of the king unto the priests and Levites concerning any matter or concerning the treasures. [2 Chron. VIII. 14, 15.] When he deprived Abiathar of the high priest's office we do not find that he had exceeded any authority belonging to his regal office as head of the nation. Nothing is said on this point, although we find some other kings severely dealt with for invading the priest's office. We find also that Jehosephat, Hezekiah, and Josiah, kings that received divine approbation, made many arrangements in ecclesiastical matters. Jehosephat sent Levites also to teach in Judah the law of the Lord. [2 Chron. XVII. 8.] After Jehosephat had visited his kingdom he gave judicial powers to persons set apart for the service of God, "he set judges in the land throughout all the fenced cities of Judah, city by city, and said to the judges; "Take heed what ye do, for ye judge not for man, but for the Lord, who is with you in the judgment. Wherefore, now, let the fear of the Lord be upon you, take heed and do it, for there is no iniquity with the Lord our God, nor respect of persons, nor taking of gifts. Moreover, in Jerusalem did Jehosephat set of the Levites and of the priests, and of the chief of the fathers of Israel, for the judgment of the Lord, and for controversies, when they returned to Jerusalem. And he charged them, saying, Thus shall ye do in the fear of the Lord, faithfully and with a perfect heart." [2 Chron. XIX.] Of Hezekiah, of whom it is said, that, "he did that which was right in the sight of the Lord," [2 Chron. XXIX. 2,] it is recorded that "in the first year of his reign" he "opened the doors of the house of the Lord and repaired them." "And said, Hear me, ye Levites, sanctify now yourselves, and sanctify the house of the Lord God of your fathers, and carry forth the filthiness out of the holy place, for our fathers have trespassed, and done that which was evil in the eyes of the Lord our God, and have forsaken Him, and have turned away their faces from the habitation of the Lord, and turned their backs"

(ver. 6). "My sons, be not now negligent: for the Lord hath chosen you to stand before Him, to serve Him, and that ye should minister unto Him, and burn incense" (ver. 11). "Then the Levites arose, and came, according to the commandment of the king, by the words of the Lord, to cleanse the house of the Lord." The service of the house of the Lord was set in order. Who can say that all these efforts on the part of kings could be displeasing to the Almighty King of all the earth? Who can presume to say, after the above, that God is displeased with a king for striving to promote His glory, according to the knowledge he possesses, and after the manner of which he has had some intimation from His holy word, as the above-named kings had in the law of Moses? The history of the Church in former ages is not to be unheeded. Past dealings, whether in the shape of mercies or judgments are not to be disregarded.

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." [2 Tim. III. 16.] We find also that Hezekiah not only commanded the Levites, but also "the priests, the sons of Aaron" (ver. 31), and after that he orders a Passover and also "appointed the courses of the priests," and when the commandment went forth "the children of Israel brought in the tithe of all" [2. Chron. XXX. and XXXI.] In all these efforts to restore the service of God, and extend the knowledge of the true God among the people there was no introduction of new plans to attract attention, but an adherence as far as possible to the Word of God and the previous practices of the Church. In more humiliating days we find that the feast of Purim was instituted by authority from King Ahaseurus. [Esther III. and IX.], and the Kings of Persia gave liberty to Ezra and Nehemiah to make arrangements in sacred things.

Who can say that kings and civil rulers are precluded by their office from taking an active part in supporting the Church upon earth? In the New Testament we have the support of the Saviour Himself in submitting to the temporal arrangements of the civil government under which we may live, even if that civil government be of a different religion, which may be quite opposed and hostile to our own. Our Saviour's instruction to the Jews ought to be enough to satisfy those who plead tender consciences "render under Cæsar the things which *are* Cæsar's, and unto God the things which *are* God's," [Matt. XXII. 21.], thus evincing most clearly that the laws of Christianity were never intended

to put aside or diminish the temporal authority of the "powers that are ordained of God" or the civil government under which we may live, but to influence rulers and to infuse into their laws something of that spirit which is "pure, lovely, and of good report."

St. Paul, when writing to Titus, directed him in regard to his teaching, and, among many other things, one was to "put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates" [Titus III. 1,] and this he did before there were any Christian magistrates and rulers. There was no provision or exceptions for scruples of conscience, as they so much plead for in the present day.

St. Peter, to the same effect, exhorts strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia: "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king as supreme, or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well" (1 Peter II. 13, 14).

I have been as short as I well could on the Scriptural authority for Church and State co-operating; still I am aware that, with very many, the Scriptural argument has little weight, since they advocate the notion that every person must judge for himself on the interpretation of the Bible, without respect to the voice of the Church, which has handed down to us the opinions of those who lived nearest the fountain-head of Divine Truth. I have also endeavoured to show the superior claims of the Church of England to be the Established Church of this kingdom—claims far beyond the many sects which, in modern days, call themselves churches. If the subject is handled in general terms, confining ourselves to the proof that the State may adopt some external profession of religion, we should fall far short of the object of this work. What is of chief importance in the present day is, that the great struggle seems to be to shake off all connection of the State with the Episcopal Church, which has so long had the affections of the people generally. If we merely attempt to prove that the State should be in alliance with the Christian religion in some shape, the case is still open for all the numerous sects or forms of Christianity to put in their claim. We contend that there is only one body of professing Christians that can be united with the State to its advantage.

The past history of our country affords testimony enough to the mischief that resulted when the Church of Rome,

Puritanism, Presbytery, Independency, and Nonconformity had the ascendancy. We have already noticed this in preceding pages. As far as our limits will allow, I think we shall best understand how Church and State work together, if we give our attention more particularly to the Canons of the Church from the earliest ages, and the position which kings and emperors have taken in the various emergencies which have arisen. The principle upon which they have acted is laid down in the Novels of Justinian.

Nov. 109 Praef.—Unam nobis esse in omni nostræ reipublicæ et imperii vita in Deo spem credimus, scientes, quia hæc nobis et animæ et imperii dat salutem. Unde et legislationes nostras inde pendere competit, et in eam respicere et hoc eis principium esse et medium, et terminum.

From which it is to be seen that the civil law considered hope in God to be in the life of the State, and that all legislation depends upon it, and that it is the beginning, the middle, and the end of it.

With respect to the attitude of the State towards the Canons of the Church, we have ample evidence in Nov. 137 Praef., which lays down, that if we are zealous that the civil laws should be rigidly observed, by how much more ought we to employ zeal in the observance of the Holy Canons and Sacred Laws which were appointed for the safety of our souls :

“ Si civiles leges, quarum potestatem nobis deus pro clementia sua credidit, ad securitatem subditorum per omnia firmiter servari studemus, quanto majus studium in observatione sanctorum canonum et sacrarum legum, quæ pro salute animarum nostrarum constitutæ sunt, collocare debemus.”

The Church and State are two distinct bodies. The Church has no power to punish its member for breach of discipline beyond expulsion or excommunication—punishments terrible, but spiritual only. It is the State alone that can use the sword. The surest way to discover the good effects of union and co-operation is to trace proceedings age after age from the earliest period of the Church of Christ, both in the East and West, noticing more particularly the state of events in the History of the Church of England. This is really a subject calling forth more matter than our limits will allow ; still enough may be compressed in a few pages to satisfy the mind of any candid reader as to the beneficial effects resulting from a close and harmonious connection between the Church and State. By the Church I mean that true and Apostolic Church established in this kingdom which can trace its connection link by link with the

Church in which the Apostles of our blessed Saviour and their disciples shone so pre-eminently.

There are a few points which it may be well to notice when examining the canons of the Church. We shall find that the Church acted as an independent body on all *doctrines* of religion, and in such points of *discipline* as tended to unite the members, while they had no power to enforce discipline beyond expulsion or excommunication.

Previous to Constantine there was no emperor professing and encouraging Christianity. We shall refer first to the Apostolical Canons which are acknowledged to be of a very early date. If they are to be considered as a collection of canons passed at councils in different ages and countries, some of them may be assigned to a very early date. Canon $\frac{25}{30}$:—*

“If any bishop making use of the secular power do thereby obtain a church let him be deposed; and they who communicate with him be suspended from Communion.”

This shows care was taken to keep the Church from interference from any external power in regard to its spiritual arrangements. At this time the Roman Emperors and their deputies were heathens.

That the Bishops and not the people supplied a vacant See appears from Canon $\frac{29}{38}$ “If any one being ordained Bishop do not accept the Liturgy, and care of the people entrusted with him, let him be suspended from Communion until he do accept it (and in like manner the priests and deacons). But if he go and be not accepted by the reason of the perverseness of the people and not of his own wilfulness, let him remain bishop, but let the clergy of that city be suspended from Communion because they have not been correctors of such a refractory people.”

In this canon it is evident that the people did not choose the bishop, for if they had done so before the ordination, they were not likely to reject him afterwards.

By Canon $\frac{30}{37}$ there was to be a Provincial Synod twice every year—*i.e.*, a Synod of Bishops, the last to which they could appeal in the primitive Church. “Let them determine all doctrines of religion among themselves, and put an end to all ecclesiastical controversies that happen.”

Canon $\frac{72}{31}$, “We have before charged that a bishop or Priest should not descend to places of administration in the civil government, but let him always be at leisure to do his ecclesiastical duty; let him either obey by forbearing this, or

* These Canons are differently numbered.

be deposed : for no man can serve two masters, according to our Lord's declaration." The reason of this canon was to prevent them doing anything that might encourage idolatry which in all probability might occur as the heathen religion was supported by the State.

But about A.D. 272 the Church at Antioch was unable to enforce its own decrees when a council had decreed against Paul of Samosata, on a charge of heresy, and deposed him. They called on the Emperor Aurelian to decide ; not on doctrinal points, for he was a heathen. Zenobia, on the death of her husband, Odenatus, assumed the imperial title and for some time set at defiance the power of Rome. Paul, Bishop of Antioch, seems to have gained her support so much that he, when deposed, and another bishop appointed in his place, refused to give up the Church. When Aurelian marched with an army against Zenobia, and gained possession of the city, he was appealed to by the Christians and settled the dispute by ordering the building to be given up to those whom *the Christian Bishops of Italy and Rome* should appoint. Paul was thus compelled to resign the Church by the temporal power.*

This was a decision respecting the property of the Church, which, like all property in a nation, was subject to the law of the nation in such matters, and therefore might be referred to the decision of the emperor without involving any religious question peculiar to the claims of Christianity. Eusebius tells us that Aurelian decided most equitably on the business.

Christianity, notwithstanding its opposition to the religion of the empire, must have gained considerable influence at this time, and Aurelian, no doubt, was anxious to conciliate this distant province to the authority at Rome. Independently of heresy, Paul, Bishop of Antioch, might probably have violated the $\frac{7}{8}$ of the Apostolical Canons. "A bishop or priest should not descend to places of administration in the civil government."

It is thought that he must have held some lucrative situation under the civil government through Zenobia, as his splendour and extravagance far exceeded any revenues which his position in the Church could command.† Be that as it may we have a singular instance of the independence of the Church in spiritualities and internal arrangements while in temporalities it was dependent on the State for the

* Eusebius E. H. Book 7, c. 80.

† Claude de Saumaise Hist. August, p. 124.

recovery of its rights. How it might have been had this dispute occurred a few years later is doubtful, for Eusebius says "he began to cherish different sentiments with regard to us, and then proceeded, influenced by certain advisers, to raise a persecution against us." We learn from the above that the emperor left the matter to be decided by the bishops of the Church, and then exercised his civil authority to compel Paul to yield to the decrees of the Church. The State here did not decide, but enforced compliance in reference to the temporalities.

In A.D. 315 a synod was held at Ancyra, in Galatia, for restoring discipline and regulating the penances of those who had lapsed in the time of persecution. From the 18th Canon it appears that the people did not choose a bishop, but that choice was left to those who constituted the synod. The 18th Canon is thus :—"If any being constituted bishops, but not received by the parish to which they were nominated, will invade other parishes and use violence against those who are the settled bishops and move sedition against them, let them be suspended from communion." This canon having been passed, notwithstanding the existence of one to the same effect among the Apostolical Canons, shows that bishops were not elected by the populace. When he took up his residence among them they might and, as the canon intimates, they did sometimes set their faces against the ministrations of the new bishop. It has ever been the custom of the Churches to acknowledge the right of bishops to supply vacant churches with one of their own order. No ordination can take place without them, and it has never been supposed that any other order or class of men has authority to ordain. This has been the universal practice of the Church for *more than* 1,800 years, except of late, when some sects have arisen asserting their independence, but which have never been able to hold themselves together in unity, peace, and concord, as well as the rest of Christendom has done, through the bond of union effected by episcopacy or the apostolical succession. In the canons passed at the Synod of Neo-Caesarea, a city in Pontus, held about the same time with that at Ancyra, A.D. 314 or 315, there is a confirmation of a similar one in the Canon Apost. $\frac{19}{27}$, which was not quite so strict, and thus confirms the pre-existence of the Apost. Canons.

In the Canons of St. Peter of Alexandria, who died a martyr, A.D. 311, in the persecution begun by Diocletian, carried on by Maximinian, we have two which show that

the Church discouraged hasty and rash conduct in their Christian profession when living under a heathen Government. Canon 9.—“That they who provoked the magistrates to persecute themselves and others are to be blamed, yet not to be denied Communion.” Canon 10.—“That clergymen who run themselves into persecution and fell, though they did afterwards recover themselves and suffer torments, yet are not to be admitted to perform the sacred office.”

These canons show how the Church at Alexandria expected people to conduct themselves towards the civil government hostile to their religious profession.

The Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325, was attended with consequences important to the Church. Without dwelling on the causes which led to it, and the discussions which took place, which would be foreign to the purpose of this work, I would briefly notice how important to the Church, and the good order and peace of the empire, was the interest which Constantine manifested in the affairs of the Church. The Church was looked upon as a body distinct from the State, and acknowledged as such; for Constantine, although he acted towards it in temporal matters according to the laws of the Empire, yet in all questions affecting the doctrines and internal arrangements of the Church, he did not interfere, but left them to be decided by the recognised ministers of the Church; and when they had come to a decision, he then gave them the support of the civil power. There was no interference with, and dictation to, the successors of the apostles, but when the Church, by its council, had come to a decision, its regulations had the support of the State.

When the Emperor heard of the troubles of the Church, in consequence of the Arian controversy, he endeavoured to put an end to them. He sent Hosius, the Bishop* of Cordova, to Alexandria, hoping that he would be able to put an end to the dispute; but he was disappointed in that respect, and therefore proceeded to summon the Council of Nice, and commanded that the bishops, and those connected with them, should be mounted on the asses, mules, and horses belonging to the public, in order to repair thither. When all who could attend had arrived at Nice, he went thither himself from the desire of preserving unanimity amongst them. He arranged that all their wants should be liberally supplied.† Although Constantine considered him-

* Euseb. *Life of Const.* 3—7; Socrates, *E. H.* 1—7; Sozomon, *E. H.* 1—16.

† Theodoret, *E. H.* 1—7.

self head of the temporal affairs within his dominions, he did not attempt to make himself head over the spiritual and internal arrangements of the Church. He was sensible it was a body distinct from any earthly kingdom, and he knew that it had, in an extraordinary manner, extended its influence in defiance of the persecutions to which it had been exposed. When the bishops met to hold their deliberations, the emperor, attended by a few followers, was the last to enter the room. A low stool was placed for him in the middle of the assembly, upon which he did not seat himself until he had *asked the permission of the bishops*. In doing so we have an intimation of the feeling that was then prevalent, that the civil power had no right to interfere with the spiritual power invested in the Church, beyond assisting the Church in carrying out its decisions, and preventing disorder in the State.

Canon 8, of the Council of Nice, shows the opinion of the Church in regard to episcopal ordination, and confirms the canons of previous councils on that point. There is also a Canon 6, made at Gangra, in Paphlagonia, about A.D. 340, wherein it is decreed, "If any hold other assemblies privately beside the Church, and will have ecclesiastical offices performed without a priest (constituted) by the consent of the bishop, let him be *Anathema*."

Only a year after the last-named council was held there was one at Antioch, A.D. 341, at which there were upwards of 90 bishops, on the occasion of dedicating a great Church built there by Constantius, the Emperor. The distinction between the ecclesiastical and civil power is clearly acknowledged. The independence of the Church in spiritual and internal affairs is evident, while the aid of the power of the State or civil power, which is called the external, is acknowledged to be requisite for reducing those who persist in vexing and disturbing the Church.

Canon 5.—"If any priest or deacon, despising his bishop, separating from the Church and hold a private assembly, and fix an altar and disobey the first and second warning of his bishop, let him be finally deposed and have no further remedy, and not again admitted to his honour; and if he persist in vexing and disturbing the Church he is to be reduced by the external (that is the civil) power."

The feeling between the Church and the civil power is apparent, notwithstanding the objections that have been made against these canons.

Canons 11 and 12, at this synod, were intended to stop

appeals to the emperor in any matter connected with the spiritualities of the Church. By the 11th, if a bishop, priest, or person, that at all belongs to the canon, go to the emperor without the consent and letters of the bishops of the province, and especially of the metropolitan, he shall not only be abdicated and ejected from the communion, but also from the dignity which he has, as presuming to trouble the ears of the emperor, beloved by God, contrary to the law of the Church ; but, if necessary business require him to go to the emperor, he is to do it with the advice and consent of the metropolitan of the province, and the (bishops) of the same, and to be conducted by *their* letters.

But the next Canon, the 12th, was decreed in reference to the case of Athanasius, who had been deposed by a synod, but recalled from exile by the emperor. It appears that if a deposition took place by a synod, restoration must be made by a superior synod—in other words the sentence of the Church could only be relaxed by the Church. When the civil power interfered and reversed the decision of the ecclesiastical, there was a collision, which the following Canon, the 12th, was intended to avoid :—"If any priest or deacon, being deposed by his bishop, or any bishop being deposed by the synod, do presume to trouble the emperor's ears, it is fit that he be referred to a greater synod of bishops, and to allege what he thinks reasonable in his own behalf before those bishops, and to abide by the examination and decision made by them. But, if despising them, he trouble the emperor, he shall be treated as one who deserves no pardon, nor be allowed another hearing, nor have any hopes of restitution for the future." There is one point concerning appeals deserving attention. An appeal was only allowed when there was a small majority. There could be none when the sentence of the provincial bishops was unanimous. Canon 15.—"If any bishop, upon an accusation preferred against him, be condemned by all the bishops of the province *unanimously* he shall not have his cause heard over again by others ; but the *unanimous* sentence of the provincial bishops shall stand."

The 16th Canon discloses something of the mind of the Church in the Fourth Century relative to the views entertained in regard to popular elections to the sacred ministry,—"If any bishop, without a see, throw himself into a vacant church and usurp the throne without a full synod, he shall be ejected, though the people whom he usurps have chosen him ; that is, a full synod, in which the metropolitan is present."

In Canon 23, it is decreed, "that a bishop be made no otherwise than in a synod and by the judgment of the bishops."

In the 25th Canon there is an intimation that the revenues of the Church arise partly from a permanent source, we read of "rents of the farms." This was after the empire had become Christian.

About twenty-two years after the Council at Nice, A.D. 347, there was a Synod at Sardica, in consequence of some disagreement in the case of Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, whose deposition had been under consideration. By the joint consent of the Emperors Constance and Constantius a synod was appointed to meet at Sardica, in Illyricum, where Athanasius and other bishops are absolved. Thus a decision was given in favour of Athanasius by the Church, as if to make up for any irregularity on the part of the emperor. It appears that the decisions of a synod could only be reversed by a greater synod, and not by the civil power which, on some occasions, carried out the decisions of the bishops. It does not appear that laymen or even priests took any part at provincial synods. Ancient synods consisted of bishops, as appears from Canon 13,—*"The bishop that knowingly receives a refugee priest, deacon, or clerk, excommunicated by his own bishop, shall give account of himself to the bishops assembled in synod."*

After the emperor had shown some disposition to assist the Church, there was a fear of the advantage being abused to selfish and unworthy purposes, as appears from the last canon of this council—*"Every bishop, dwelling in the road to court, shall examine every bishop that he sees, and if he find anyone invited to court let him give him no delay; but if he go for any evil ends let him not subscribe his letters nor communicate with him."*

About twenty years after the last-named synod there was one at Laodicea, A.D. 367, for the revival of discipline. We there find the same regard to discipline, and a similar position between the Church and the civil power as we have noticed in the canons of the preceding synods. Canon 5—*"That elections ought not to be made in the presence of the hearers."* Canon 13—*"That the multitude be not permitted to choose them who are to be ordained to the priesthood."* The Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, was assembled to consider the case of Macedonius, who denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost; and, at the same time, precaution was taken to check irregular ordinations through which succession might

be imparted to heretics and schismatics. Canon 2—"Let not bishops go out of their diocese to churches out of their bounds, nor bring confusion on the churches. . . . And the aforesaid canon concerning dioceses being observed, it is evident that the Provincial Synod will have the management of every province, as was decreed at Nice." The 6th Canon of Theopilus, Archbishop of Alexandria, about A.D. 385, enjoins, "that all in Holy Orders unanimously choose those who are to be ordained, and then the bishop examine (them), or that the bishop ordain them in the midst of the Church, all that are in holy orders consenting, and the bishop, with a loud voice, asking the people who are then to be present whether they can give their testimony."

Zosimus, Bishop of Rome, A.D. 417, decrees "against those who apply themselves to the Court of the Emperor in opposition to him, he declares such audacious disturbers of the peace anathematized."

Boniface, Bishop of Rome, A.D. 419, decrees [4] "To Hilary, Bishop of Narbon, that one, Patroclus, had ordained a bishop to Lutuba, a see in Hilary's province, without his consent; therefore he bids Hilary, according to the Nicene Canon [Canon 7], to go to the vacant see and proceed to a new ordination."

We shall cross the Mediterranean Sea and examine the African code, which was a collection made out of many canons of previous councils, most of which had been held at Carthage. Many of these canons were incorporated in the Excerptions of Egbert and thereby introduced into England.

By the 15th Canon, "If any bishop, priest, deacon, or clergyman, when he is charged with any crime in the Church, decline any ecclesiastical judicature, and apply himself to the civil, if it be in a criminal matter he shall lose his place, though he carry his cause; but in a civil matter he shall lose what he recovered by suit, if he will retain his place."

There was no doubt great occasion to restrain bishops and clergymen going to the civil courts, which were not connected with a government which had united itself with the Church. Communion was denied those in Africa who thought "fit to appeal to those beyond sea," by Canon 28. This canon, with the rest, was received by the Church of Rome. So particular was the Church, on the point of ordination, to prevent any opportunity of irregular or un-Christian influence, or any likelihood of such obtaining apostolical authority, it was decreed "that none be ordained

bishops, priests, or deacons till they have made all of their family Catholic Christians." [Canon 36.]

If when the bishops met to choose a bishop for a vacant see, persons should object among the people and oppose the election, the 50th Canon directs that the objections against him be examined. The people did not choose their bishop but might give information if they knew anything objectionable in his character and conduct. We have next a Canon 58, where the Church decides to petition the emperor on a point in which the State had jurisdiction. In this case there was no yielding of the peculiar power of the Church as a spiritual body. The canon was "that the heathen temples which yet remain, especially in the maritime parts, be destroyed if they be not an ornament to the place. There seems to have been an understanding between the African Church and the civil power in regard to extent of power possessed by each body. To maintain proper discipline was a desire that the Church and civil power should not come in collision; it was also decided that the emperor be also petitioned, "that he would make a decree that, when any (secular) cause has been tried in the Church, according to the apostolic law,* and the decision of the clergy does not satisfy both parties, that neither the clergyman who took cognizance of the cause nor any other who was present be compelled to give evidence in the (temporal) judicature." [Canon 59.]

We find that the emperor was petitioned on several points over which the State had control,—such as festivals of the Gentiles, theatrical shows on the nativities of martyrs, and on the Lord's Day, the manumission of slaves,—to assist the Catholic Church and guard the authority of bishops where the Maximianists, who had divided from the Donalists, have possession of the Churches. [Canon 67.]

In Canon 84 it was decreed "that the Most Glorious Emperors be petitioned that the remains of idolatry, not only images, but places, groves, and trees be extirpated."

There are canons against appeals to foreign jurisdiction: $\frac{2}{31}$ and $\frac{1}{128}$.

There is no precedent from these canons for either priests, deacons, or laymen having a right to take a part in decisions at synods. Deacons who might accompany the bishops were present at the discussion. That all the bishops might be no longer detained in council it was agreed that

* 1 Corinth vi. 1, 2, &c.

three commissioners be chosen out of each province. Thus this synod is an instance of authority delegated to others. [Canon $\frac{121}{128}$.]

In the canons of the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, we have decrees forbidding bishops procuring their own cities to be made into metropolitan cities by application to the emperor, who had power to rearrange and alter civil jurisdictions according to which the Church, in some measure, was guided in arranging districts for bishops and metropolitans. The holy synod decreed, "That nothing of this sort be enterprised by any bishop for the future, for he who undertakes it must be degraded from his dignity."

Canon 17. "If any one be wronged by his metropolitan let his cause be tried by the Exarch of the diocese, or the throne of Constantinople, as is aforesaid. If any city be new-built by the emperor the ordering of the parishes shall be according to the civil pattern."

The 19th Canon intimates that the Provincial Synod consisted of bishops who were expected to meet twice every year; and, by the 21st Canon, "That clergymen or laymen be not admitted promiscuously and without inquiry to accuse bishops or clergymen until their own reputation has been examined." It will be instructive to our readers if they will compare this canon with the measure recently assented to by a large majority of the House of Lords, which, if passed by the Commons and assented to by the Crown, will allow any three laymen with impunity to bring accusations against the clergy, and that among other things respecting the celebration of the Holy Communion, when they themselves by non-reception put at defiance the command of the Great Head of the Church respecting it.

This reminds us of a canon decreed at Constantinople, A.D. 381, about seventy years before the last-named canon at Chalcedon. It is of considerable length but deserving attention in the present day.

Canon 6. "Because many do maliciously, and by subornation, contrive informations against the orthodox bishops who govern the churches, with a design to confound and subvert ecclesiastical order, and endeavouring nothing else but to sully the reputation of priests and to raise disturbances among peaceable people. For this reason the Holy Synod of Bishops met at Constantinople, hath decreed that informers be not admitted without examination, and that neither all be allowed to make information against them who govern the churches nor all excluded; but if anyone bring a private or

personal accusation against a bishop as having been oppressed or injured by him, no regard shall be had of the person or religion of him who brings the accusation, for it is fit that the conscience of a bishop should be clear in every respect, and that he who says that he is wronged should have justice done to him of whatever religion soever he be. But if an ecclesiastical crime be objected against the bishop, then the person of him who brings the accusation shall be considered, that so, in the first place, heretics may not prefer information concerning ecclesiastical matters against orthodox bishops, (we call them heretics who have formerly been abdicated by the Church and afterwards anathematised by us, and further them who pretend to confess the sound faith but have made a schism and gathered congregations in opposition to the canonical bishops,) and likewise that they who are either of the clergy or of the rank of laymen who, for certain crimes, stand condemned, ejected, or excommunicated by the Church, may not accuse a bishop till they are cleared from the crimes charged upon them. And that likewise they who are themselves accused beforehand be not allowed to accuse a bishop or clergyman till they have proved themselves to be innocent of the crimes objected against them. But if there are any who are neither heretics, nor excommunicated, nor condemned, nor beforehand accused for any crimes, do say that they have information of an ecclesiastical nature against the bishops, the Holy Synod commands the information to be first preferred before all the provincial bishops and before them to prove the accusations preferred against the bishop; and if they be not sufficient to make a decision concerning the informations made against the bishop, then that they go to the greater synod of the bishops of this diocese summoned together for this cause; and let not the informers be permitted to produce their allegations till they have obliged themselves in writing to some penalty equal (to what the bishop, in case he be convicted, shall incur) if it be made appear that the information against the bishop was false and feigned. But if anyone dare trouble the emperor's ears, or the temporal judicatures, or a general council, neglecting the bishops of the diocese, he shall by no means be allowed to give information, as being one that throws contempt and reproach upon the canons and subverts the ecclesiastical order." [See also Council of Antioch, Canon 12.]*

* Concil. Illob. c. 73, A.D. 305. Delator si quis exstiterit fidelis, et per delationem ejus aliquis fuerit proscriptus vel interfectus, placuit eum nec in fine accipere communionem. Si levior causa fuerit, intra quinquennium accipere,

But to return to the Chalcedonian Canons. In 23 and 26 we read of an officer, called *CEconomus*, who managed the ecclesiastical estate at the direction of the bishop, a proof that the Church did not at that time depend entirely on the offerings of the people, or what in modern days is called the voluntary system, but also on permanent provisions, which certainly were voluntary gifts only to an amount which enabled them to secure provision for future demands on the funds of the Church. It appears, from the decrees of Simplicius, Bishop of Rome, A.D. 475, that the Church had estate in lands: "Whereas John had given to Gregory an estate in lands, belonging to the Church of Ravenna, Simplicius orders that this be restored; but that, instead thereof, he have an estate of 30 solids for life settled on him by John, out of the Church of Ravenna." These decrees were issued A.D. 481. In the decrees of Anastasius, Bishop of Rome, A.D. 498, he requests the aid of the civil power [4, 5]; he says: "That all contention ought to be laid aside; and desires that the emperor would reduce the Alexandrians to the Catholic faith, and that the apostolical precepts of the Pope may be obeyed."

In the Church history of the seventh century there is a warning to England in the present day, when there is so much said about trying to unite those to the Church who deny some of the important doctrines and discipline of the Church of England. There is a readiness to sanction false principles and compromise the truth in the vain expectation of promoting unity in Church and State. If we review the opinions of the numerous sects that surround us, we must sacrifice the greatest part of the important truths we believe; in fact, there would be little left for us to believe. To please one, baptism of infants must be disregarded; to please others, the Holy Communion must be shorn of its essential parts; to please a third, anything in reference to the divinity of our Blessed Saviour must be expunged. I might go on to a considerable length in showing, that to meet the views of separatists, we must give up believing almost all of those divine truths which we have from our earliest years considered important. There have

poterit communionem. Si catechumenus fuerit, post quinquennii tempora admittatur ad baptismum.—Labbe, vol. I.

Concil. Arelat l. c. 14, A.D. 314. De his qui falso accusant fratres suos, placuit eos usque ad exitum non communicare.—Labbe, vol. I.

Codex Theodos., lib. 9, tit. 1, de Accusationibus leg. II. Qui alterius famam fortunas, caput denique, et sanguinem in iudicium devocaverit, sciat, sibi impendere congruam poenam, si, quod intenderit, non probavit.—A.D. 438.

been false notions of charity abroad among us of late years, and I think that what has tended very much to the present state of opinion on religious matters, is the general ignorance and disregard and unwillingness to believe that God has a Church in the world, to which He has given promises, and assurance of His presence, and that distinctive marks of His providential care and superintendence of that Church, may be discerned in its progress through nations, both in their rise and fall. The tone of teaching and preaching amongst us, for many years, has been more on points which we need NOT believe, than on those essential subjects on which every Christian is expected to have clear and satisfactory views. Dissenters find fault with the Roman Catholics for believing articles which we, as well as they, think non-essential; yet Dissenters forget that they themselves believe too few doctrines and facts. Which is best, to believe too much, or too little? The members of the Church of Rome believe all that we of the Church of England believe, with several things in addition, while Dissenters not only reject the unnecessary articles of the Romish Church, but they reject many of the remaining points which the Church of England and the Church of Rome believe in common. Now, if the Church of England is to relinquish any part of her Creeds and wholesome discipline, to conciliate Dissenters, infidels, and sceptics, with a view of making its public services palatable to all, and so induce them to unite with us; those who advocate such a course, may learn, if they will, that such proceedings can never expect a blessing. What is the use of history, whether sacred or profane, if we disregard the rise, progress, and result of events, whether to individuals or nations? We may have an illustration from the controversies which disturbed the Church in the seventh century. There was an attempt on the part of the Emperor Heraclius to reunite the Eutychians to the Church. The Church was distracted with divisions, and the State in confusion, mainly in consequence of an attempt to gain peace by the maintenance of principles that encouraged a sacrifice of truth. After a conference with the leaders of the Monophysite sect, the emperor found there was a prospect of gaining them over, provided the Church agreed that in Christ there was but "one will and one operation." Heraclius issued an edict favouring the doctrine. Some of the more influential bishops received it favourably, and, in consequence, many Monophysites were received into the Church, while Honorius, Bishop of Rome, admitted the heretics into communion.

There was a sacrifice of divine truth and the admission of error for the end of State purposes; and how did this short-sighted policy answer? This compromise of truth led to still greater confusion. The Church, through want of consistency and firmness, lost its influence for a time. After many struggles, for some fifty years, the compromising principles from which so much advantage was expected, were found ineffectual, and the supporters of the scheme condemned in the sixth Œcumenical Synod, held at Constantinople, by order of the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus, A.D. 680. Brief as this account is, it is enough, I trust, to induce the candid inquirer to extend his reading on this important period of ecclesiastical history, which is illustrative of the folly of attempting to conciliate by the admission of false principles, and the sacrifice of truth. Such a course evidently tends to promote an extension of schism and heresy, which give the enemy an opportunity of making further devastation. It is a remarkable fact, that Mahommedanism gained its conquests more easily, where heresy and schism prevailed the most.

This was the case in Arabia and the East, where separatists made common cause with infidels and joined against the Church. In Africa, where schisms prevailed, Mahommedanism rapidly gained conquests over the country that could once boast of its numerous churches. These are warnings to Englishmen. Our prosperity hitherto as a nation is no security that we shall retain the religious privileges we now possess. Many other nations, eminent in the world, with the light of Christianity to guide them in all its fulness, have sunk into insignificance. And have we not reason to fear lest we be deprived of those means of grace, which so many, through a schismatical spirit, neglect and reject. The petition in our Litany is very suitable at the present time.—“From all false doctrine, heresy and schism; from hardness of heart and contempt of Thy word and commandments, Good Lord deliver us.”

We have endeavoured to show from the canons of the Primitive Church, as well as those of the Universal, Eastern, Western and African Churches, the position which the Catholic Church and the civil power held towards each other. The canons of the Church, enacted at acknowledged synods, show more clearly than the opinions of contemporary history (which may be biassed) the true state of things; for at those synods at which there were the representatives of the Church from every district for miles around, the requirements of

the Church were brought forward, as well as its difficulties, and had due consideration.

It is impossible to arrive at a true account of the Catholic Church in any part of the world if its canons and authoritative regulations are not consulted. Reference to Acts of Parliament throws more light than anything else on the social and political condition of our country.

There are a few points very apparent on consulting the authoritative documents of the Church. The position of the Catholic Church as a spiritual body, to leaven the mass of mankind, and infuse the spirit of holiness among them, is independent of any external power, and that independence has only been established through the singular support and interposition of the God of heaven and earth. It has retained its position generation after generation, notwithstanding the storms and waves of this troublesome world. The Christian believer sees the Divine promises realized, whether the Church be in weal or woe. Wherever the civil power has been touched with the influence of Christianity the internal affairs of the Church have been left to the decision of those who have not taken up the office of their own accord, but been called and instituted by them that have authority. With respect to the authority of laymen, there seems to be no countenance from the canons and proceedings at synods. Laymen might have been admitted to *hear* the proceedings, for the Church did not court secrecy. We find that laymen are admitted to the convocation of our own Church that they may hear the discussions that take place, but no one ever heard of their voting or deciding on the points at issue. So it was at the councils of the Church in general. The proceedings at the Council of Nice, which we have already noticed, confirm the foregoing opinion respecting laymen. Theodoret [E. H. Lib.] informs us that "Constantine, although he considered himself head of the temporal affairs within his dominions, did not attempt to make himself head over the spiritual and internal arrangements of the Church." His manner before he took his seat among them showed that he considered he had no right to interfere in the spiritual and internal arrangements of the Church, while he was ready, as head of civil affairs, to co-operate in carrying out the decisions of the Church.

This is confirmed by Eusebius in his life of Constantine, [Book III. ch. 10]—"As soon as he (Constantine) had advanced to the upper end of the seats; at first he remained standing, and when a low chair of wrought gold had been set

for him he waited until the bishops had beckoned to him and then sat down, and after him the whole assembly did the same."

It appears that priests and others attended the council. In what capacity we may learn from Eusebius and Sozomen. The former informs us that, "the number of the presbyters and deacons in the train of the bishops and other attendants was altogether beyond computation.

"Julius, Bishop of Rome, was unable to attend on account of extreme old age, but his place was supplied by Vito and Vicentius, presbyters of his church." [Sozomen, book I. 27.]

If the bishops were accompanied by a multitude of presbyters and deacons, it does not follow that these decided on the business before the assembly.

Sozomen says, "as was usually the case on such occasions, many priests resorted to the council for the purpose of transacting their own private affairs, for they considered this a favourable opportunity of effecting such alterations as they deemed desirable, and of presenting petitions to the emperor, containing complaints against those by whom they considered themselves aggrieved." [Sozomen, E. H., book I. 17.]

"Besides, about seventy years before the Council of Nice, A.D. 255, Lucius, as we are informed by Platina (who died A.D. 1481), upon the death of Volusianus, son of Gallus, who was associated with his father in the government, being released from banishment, at his return to Rome ordained that every bishop should be accompanied wherever he went with two presbyters and three deacons as witnesses of his life and actions.

About forty years after the Council of Nice, viz., A.D. 365, we have the opinion of another emperor on the relative position of Church and State.

When Valentinian was journeying from Constantinople to Rome, he had to pass through Thrace, and the bishops of the Hellespont and of Bythina, with others who maintained that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, despatched Hypatian, Bishop of Heraclea, in Perinthus, to meet him, and to request permission to assemble themselves together for deliberation on questions of doctrine. When Hypatian had delivered the message with which he was entrusted, Valentinian made the following reply: "I am but one of the laity, and have, therefore, no right to interfere in these transactions; let the bishops, to whom such matters appertain, assemble where they please." On receiving this answer through Hypatian, their deputy, the bishops assembled at Lampsacus. [Sozomen, E. H., lib. VI. c. 7.]

If laymen took part in voting or deciding at Church synods there would not have been a necessity to observe a distinction between the civil and ecclesiastical powers in enacting laws. The proceedings at the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, confirm this view of the matter. The Emperor Marcian was present at this council. We do not find that he assumed any authority, nor did he show any disposition to place himself on an equal footing with the bishops in Church affairs. There were some abuses which "disturbed the affairs of the Church and civil government." He wished these to be rectified. He might have enacted a civil law to meet the cases, but, as he said to the bishops, "out of honour to their reverence he had reserved them, thinking it more decent that they should be drawn up into canons by them, than enacted into a law by him." The canons enacted in consequence were the 3rd, 4th, and 20th.

We have hitherto dwelt upon these canons of councils which were received by the Universal Church, besides others enacted by the Eastern and Western Churches, and also the African Church, as these were either formally received or had influence on the ecclesiastical polity of England. So little is known previous to the time of Augustine respecting British synods or councils, it is unnecessary, in furtherance of our purpose, to dwell upon them. The British Church was then so depressed, and the bishops so dispersed, that the discipline of the Church could not easily be developed.

Our main object is to see what information may be elicited on a few points which immediately concern the object of this work, viz., the position of Church and State in reference to each other. Besides this it will be necessary to notice who were the individuals that took a share in the proceedings at Church synods.

We shall commence our inquiry from the time Augustine landed on our shores, as we have from that time more specific directions for the guidance of the Church, recorded in a more full and formal manner. We shall find in subsequent accounts that the harmony between Church and State was occasionally interrupted. We shall find that a similar process or course of action was pursued, as is attempted in modern times, to attain a similar end. The quiet and peaceable union between Church and State has frequently been interrupted by the spirit of aggrandisement of one party or another. In the more pure days of the Church the civil and ecclesiastical powers were not jealous of each other, but rendered mutual assistance. In the course of our investiga-

tions we shall find that the welfare of a nation was much promoted when it was in union with a Church connected link by link with the Church of those apostles with whom the Saviour gave assurance that He would be to the end of the world. A Church like this was more likely to gain the confidence of the State than a body of men recently formed, without any credentials of authority, beyond other human societies around them.

It is unnecessary to give an account of the circumstances which led to Augustine's coming to England, nor need we investigate by whom he was ordained. The date of his landing is generally fixed about A.D. 596, before the Church of Rome had put forth its claims, yet there had been in previous years considerable communication with the capital of the Roman Empire, although that intercourse had been much interrupted by affairs in other parts of the empire. We must not look on the bishops of Rome in the same light as we do several centuries afterwards. We may charitably hope they were influenced by other than purely ambitious motives. Missionaries sent forth by them from the chief city of the empire, where wealth and influence abounded, naturally looked up to them for advice and support, and as in a position similar to that of the Archbishop of Canterbury in the present day in regard to the colonies of this country. Augustine, when he propounded his questions to Gregory, Bishop of Rome, probably expected that directions and instructions from that quarter might have considerable weight and influence with the newly-converted king and his subjects. Before the Church was fairly settled, there was enough to be done in seeking conversions to the faith, and teaching the newly-converted the faith and duty of their Christian profession. In Gregory's answer to the sixth question of Augustine there are directions to secure valid ordinations in England—a subject of importance, and considered as such, in this as well as preceding and subsequent ages of the Church. I notice this point again, because it is one of the peculiarities whereby Divine Providence carries on His gracious scheme, by which He hands down and secures to posterity the means of grace, and the blessings and privileges of His Church, and it is the peculiar presence of the Saviour, guiding the ark of His Church over the waves of this troublesome world, that gives confidence to those embarked in that vessel, and convinces them of its superiority over those frail barks that are the build of modern times, and seem to have nothing to guide them beyond the schemes of

fallible man. When King Ethelbert was converted to the Christian faith, he was not backward in seeing that laws were enacted which gave protection to the Church. He called together the wise men and consulted with them. The result was the *Dooms Ecclesiastical*, which have reference more particularly to those vices which disturbed the peace of society. But after Ethelbert's death, which took place about twenty-one years after he received the faith, the accession of his son proved very prejudicial to the new Church, and this confusion was increased by the death of Sabert, King of the East Saxons, who, departing to the heavenly kingdom, left three sons still pagans.*

They immediately began to profess idolatry, which, during their father's reign, they had seemed a little to abandon, and they granted free liberty to the people under their government to serve idols, and when they saw the bishop in the church giving the Eucharist to the people, they said, why do you not give us also that white bread which you used to give to our father, and which you still continue to give to the people in the church? To whom he answered—"If you will be washed in the laver of salvation in which your father was washed, you may also partake of the holy bread of which he partook, but if you despise the laver of life, you may not receive the bread of life." They refused, and said that they did not see that they stood in need of it, and yet would eat of that bread. When admonished that the same could not be done, they told the priest that if he would not comply he should not stay in their province. The result was that Melitus and Justus left the kingdom for France; Laurentius was on the point of following, but, through some circumstances which I need not relate, prevailed on the king to abjure the worship of idols, renounce his unlawful marriage, embrace the faith of Christ, and be baptised and promote the affairs of the Church to the utmost of his power.† He also sent over into France and recalled Mellitus and Justus.

I need not relate how the nation of the Northumbrians received the faith, nor the various letters which were sent from the Bishop of Rome.‡ We have seen how firm the bishops were in insisting on the sacrament of baptism previous to the Eucharist. So convinced were they of the necessity of baptism before a person could partake of the Lord's Supper, they would leave the kingdom sooner than

* Bede, E. H., book II. 5.

† Bede E. H., book II. 6.

‡ Bede E. H., book II.

relinquish an essential point of the Christian religion. The sons of Sabert, whose conduct has been just noticed, were not long spared. When in battle with the West Saxons they were all slain with their army. However, as Bede informs us, [book II. 5] the people having been once turned to wickedness, though the authors of it were destroyed, would not be corrected, nor return to the unity of faith and charity which is in Christ. In the kingdoms of Kent and the East Saxons there was great confusion, in consequence of the death of Christian kings, who were succeeded by idolators. When kings were nursing fathers to the Church, the states were more comfortable and prosperous. We see what a difference there was in the Northumbrian kingdom, when the nation was brought to the Christian faith, through the Church's influence over both king and people.

Many years elapsed before anything could be done toward the conversion and restoration of the fallen kingdoms.

Augustine and his five successors were engaged almost seventy years in seeking converts to the Christian faith. The Church was in an unsettled state, and discipline neglected. The unsettled state of the country prevented ecclesiastical councils, and the bishops were few in number. The kingdoms of Kent and Northumberland were the most advanced, and took a chief share in ecclesiastical matters. The people of Northumberland were supplied with several bishops from the Isle of Hy (Columkill), and had observed Easter according to *their* custom. The Queen of Oswy, King of Northumberland, who came from Kent, did not observe Easter at the same time with her husband. Oswy had a conference held before them, that he might know the various opinions respecting the time for observing Easter. I am disposed to notice this meeting because an argument has been advanced in support of the claims of laymen from the Synod of Whitby, A.D. 664.* It is said, as some laymen were then present, that there is authority for their admission to convocation in the present day.

It may be remarked that at some councils individuals were present who took no part in voting or deciding. We need not say anything on kings, princes, or their representatives being present. It is right that no *large* body of men should assemble together without the permission of the civil authority, according to the spirit of the 21st Article.

* Report of Convocation at York, 1870.

Besides, as Christians in the early ages had been often misrepresented, they were disposed to let their enemies see that they were not ashamed of their proceedings. Those who were mere witnesses of their transactions, it is true, often expressed their approbation in a public manner, but when they did so no one imagined they had any share in deciding the matter. The signatures at many councils testify to that effect. On some occasions laymen of experience, in any position of life, might be asked to communicate useful information on facts, or in effect be examined as witnesses. When kings or princes attended, it is not likely they would be present without their officers of state. Hence we find, after some names, *comes* and *dux*, &c. Kings or princes exercised a veto on proceedings which were considered inimical to the laws and the prerogative of the crown. Because a few laymen might be present, it has been argued that laymen took a part in deciding on canons at ecclesiastical councils. If this argument be admissible, we might with equal justice argue that women should be admitted to convocation. Hilda, the abbess, was present at Whitby. With respect to the meeting at Whitby, it does not appear that any canons were passed. King Oswy wanted to satisfy his own mind on the observance of Easter, as his wife observed that festival according to the Western custom. After he had heard the arguments on both sides, he declared his resolution to adhere to the Western custom, to the Assembly, without waiting to hear their decision. Afterwards a certain portion of those present gave their assent. This is confirmed indirectly by proceedings at Hertford, A.D. 673. About nine years afterwards Wilfrid, who was present at Whitby as an abbot, was now present in a different capacity. "*Wilfridus Nordan Humbrosum gentis Episcopus per proprios legatorios affuit.*" Had there been any decisive measures or canons affecting the Church, more than satisfying the private opinion of King Oswy, there might have been some private recognition at Hertford; but, instead of that, there was a canon passed which was not so much needed in the southern districts over which Theodore presided, as in the Welsh and Irish portions of the Church, and in that northern diocese over which Wilfrid was placed.

"*Primum capitulum, ut sanctum diem Paschae in commune omnes servemus, Dominica post decimam quartam lunam primi mensis.*" [Concil. Herudf.]

This canon, I think, would not have been passed in reference to Easter, in so formal a manner, had the meeting

at Whitby been recognised as a pure ecclesiastical synod. Oswy wished to have the opinions of the advocates of both sides of the question, and when he had received answers to some questions, he declared his future determination how to act, before any present expressed their assent.

“Et ego vobisdico, quia hic est ostiarius ille cui ego contradicere nolo, sed in quantum novi vel valeo hujus cupio in omnibus obedire statutes ne forte me adveniente ad fores regni coelorum, non sit qui reserat averso illo qui claves tenere probatur. Haec dicente Rege faverunt assidentes quique sive astantes majores una cum mediocribus et abdicata minus perfecta institutione ad ea quae meliora cognoverant, sese transferre festinabant.” [Bede, Lib. III. 25.]

The formal manner in which the canon at Hertford was passed, along with several others, so soon as nine years after what had occurred at Whitby, induces me to conclude that the proceedings at Whitby were considered as only to satisfy the mind of Oswy, who delivered to the assembly the decision to which he had arrived. The synod at Whitby does not appear to afford any precedent for the admission of laymen into convocation.

The case of Cyprian is brought forward to show the admissibility of laymen to decide on Church affairs. On examining the epistles of that bishop, it does not appear that laymen had anything to do on doctrinal points. It is true they were consulted at that critical period of the African Church, but in what capacity will appear hereafter. There were many peculiar circumstances which induced Cyprian to attend to the opinions of presbyters and layman before he came to a decision on points connected with the discipline of the Church. He had many difficulties arising from the opposition to his election, and his retirement during the Decian persecution, when even presbyters undertook to decide matters with a spirit of independence. During his episcopate there were difficulties arising from persecution, schism, and pestilence. A considerable portion of his epistles is taken up with advice respecting the decisions to which he was anxious to arrive in reference to the re-admission of those in the Church who had lapsed during the Decian persecution. When absent from Carthage, there was laxity in the discipline, which had been prematurely exercised. The admission of laymen into Church councils is advocated on the authority of Cyprian, whose words are very much misunderstood. During his retirement, which might be for about one year and a quarter,

he wrote an epistle, [14] which is advanced in defence of the admission of laymen into convocation. A slight examination of Cyprian's words may tend to give a more correct view of his opinions. He is alleged to say in that epistle, that he was resolved to do nothing of his own private judgment, without the advice of the presbyters, and the concurrence of the people. At first sight it may seem to some favourable to the admission of laymen. His words are these: "Ad id vero, quod scripserunt mihi compresbyteri nostri Donatus et Fortunatus, Novatus et Gordius, solus rescribere nihil potui, quando a primordio episcopatus mei statuerim, nihil sine consilio vestro * et sine consensu plebis mea privatim sententiā gerere. Sed cum ad vos Dei per gratiam venero, tunc de iis, quae vel gesta sunt vel gerenda, sicut honor mutuus poscit, incommune tractabimus."

At first sight it is clear that the same Latin words are not used in reference to the part which each took in deciding on any matter. The words *consilio* and *consensu* imply, that presbyters and laymen did not take the same part, and the words "sicut honor mutuus poscit," imply a difference in connection with the words "in commune tractabimus."

Had it been the custom of the Church, previous to Cyprian's time, for the bishops at synods to decide nothing without the laity, there would have been no occasion for him to state what he had resolved from the beginning of his episcopate. Cyprian's course, abstractedly considered, was unnecessary, and his declaration was evidently different from the custom of the Church. But if we consider the difficulties arising from opposition to his election to the episcopate, the persecution which raged, as well as the schism and pestilence, and all in a short time,—we need not wonder at the course which Cyprian took. It was quite impossible for him to decide on the numerous cases of the lapsed, who wished to return to communion in the Church, without assistance from those laity who had stood (*stantes*); but we should not forget the part which they took. We do not find that doctrinal points, or change of discipline and ceremonies were ever brought before them. Cyprian had to decide on the readmission of those into communion with the Church, who had lapsed during the persecution; and as there were a great variety of cases, some worse than others, it became a difficult matter to regulate the penances. Much would depend on evidence. It was impossible for Cyprian, or anyone else, to

* * This epistle was written to the presbyters and deacons.

decide in all cases without evidence, when there were perhaps thousands of cases to be considered. The applicants for admission were well known to some of the laymen who had stood fast (*stantes*) to the faith during the persecution. Before Cyprian gave his decision, he had regard to the opinion of the people, who might be looked upon in the light of witnesses, or jurymen, to decide on a fact.

Among so many strangers Cyprian, before giving decision, found it necessary to be guided by those laity who are represented as "*stantes*." In such cases the Church was very particular in hearing only the evidence of those who had kept in communion during the heavy trials.

From Ep. 19, "Cyprianus presbyteris et diaconibus fratribus," it appears that the bishops settled all things:—"ut praepositi* cum clero convenientes . . . disponere omnia consilii communis religione possimus," although they met with the clergy [cum clero convenientes] and in the presence of the steadfast laity [praesente etiam stantium plebe].

Ep. 26. Cyprian required assistance to ascertain the truth. This accounts for his desire that they should meet together and examine the case of each. "Et ideo instetur interim epistolis, quas ad vos proxime feceram, quarum exemplum collegis quoque multis jam misi; qui rescripserunt, placere sibi, quod statuimus, nec ab eo recedendum esse, donec pace nobis a Domino reddita in unum convenire et singulorum causas examinare possimus."

There is an epistle [30] to Cyprian from the presbyters and deacons at Rome, at a time when they had no bishop, from which it appears that "in tam ingenti negotio" they agreed with Cyprian that laymen should be combined with bishops, presbyters and deacons and confessors in taking an account of the lapsed [lapsorum tractare rationem]. In a business of such vast magnitude the bishops must leave facts to be ascertained through laymen who had been dispersed into various places, where they had an opportunity of knowing how those who stood, and those who had lapsed, conducted themselves. It was in practical questions and matters of fact that laymen were concerned. The bishops decided after investigation, and the opinion of those who stood fast was received with confidence.

We have instances, however, wherein Cyprian exercised the authority peculiar to his office, without the concurrence of the laity. In some cases they were not aware of what he

* Praepositi, bishops.

had done until some time afterward. I need not give particulars respecting the cases of Aurelius, Celerinus, Numidicus. In regard to each of these he exercised an independent authority. In reference to Aurelius he commences his epistle [38] to the presbyters and deacons, and to the whole people, thus: "In ordinationibus clericis, fratres carissimi; solemus vos ante consulere et mores ac merita singulorum communi consilio ponderare. Sed expectanda non sunt testimonia humana, cum praecedunt divina suffragia."

In the case of Celerinus, Cyprian informs the presbyters, deacons, and the whole people [plebi universae] *after* the event, that he and his colleagues had joined him to the clergy, not by human suffrage, but by divine favour. Ep. 39. "Exultate itaque et gaudete nobis cum literis nostris, quibus ego et collegae mei, qui praesentes aderant, referimus ad vos Celerinum fratrem nostrum virtutibus pariter et moribus gloriosum clero nostro non humana suffragatione, sed divina dignatione conjunctum."

In another epistle, he informs them of what he had done in regard to Numidicus, without consulting the laity. In this case, it appears from Baronius in *Annal*, Anno 253, n. 94, that Numidicus was brought from some other Church, that he might be enrolled in the number of the Carthaginian presbyters, and sit among the clergy, Ep. 40: "Nuntiandum vobis fuit, patres carissimi, quod pertinneat et ad communem laetitiam et ad ecclesiae nostrae maximam gloriam. Nam admonitos nos et instructos sciatis dignatione divina, ut Numidicus presbyter adscribatur presbyterorum Carthaginiensium numero et nobiscum sedeat in clero."

When Rogatianus, a neighbouring bishop, complained by letter to Cyprian of the conduct of a deacon, the Bishop of Carthage advised him to exercise the authority which he possessed through his episcopal office, independently of any external influence. Ep. 3: "Et tu quidem honorifice circa nos et pro solita tua humilitate fecisti, ut malles de eo nobis conqueri, cum pro episcopatus vigore et cathedrae auctoritate haberes potestatem, qua posses de illo statim vindicari, certus quod collegae tui omnes gratum haberemus quod cunque circa diaconum contumeliosum sacerdotali potestate fecisses, haberis circa hujusmodi homines praecepta divina [Deut. XVII. 12, 13]. Towards the conclusion of the Ep., Cyprian reminds Rogatianus, that he would, in virtue of his office, either restrain or excommunicate—"hunc quoque et si qui alii tales extiterint et contra sacerdotem Dei fecerint, vel coercere poteris vel abstinere."

Thus, I think, it is clear that no precedent can be brought forward from the case of Cyprian in support of laymen being admitted to Convocation or the Provincial Synod. But to return to King Oswy and the meeting at Whitby on the observance of Easter.

The adoption of the Roman observance of Easter by King Oswy caused considerable changes to take place in the bishoprics, nevertheless, there was on his part a desire to encourage the spread of religion.

It is unnecessary to enter upon the controversy about the observance of Easter. The Scots and Northumbrians, in all probability, had been guided by a previous cycle for calculation, not having had an opportunity of hearing of a more recent one that had been adopted. Communication with Rome had been hindered through the unsettled state of the country. No opportunity was lost in securing for their subjects the privileges of the Church by King Oswy and King Egbert. It was evident they considered that the office of bishop was not to be taken up by any one, or filled up at the discretion of any one. So satisfied were they that it rested in a few hands and in a peculiar order to ordain and keep up proper succession that they sent those suitable for bishops to France or Rome to receive ordination. Wighard was sent by them to succeed Deusdedit as Archbishop of Canterbury, but he died at Rome by a pestilence.* Previous to this Wilfrid was sent to France for consecration. Oswy sent Chad to be consecrated, but finding Archbishop Deusdedit dead, they proceeded to Wini, Bishop of the West Saxons. Afterwards Theodore doubted the validity of his ordination, but completed it when appointed to the see of Lichfield.† Before Oswy and Egbert sent Wighard to Rome they "consulted together about the state of the English Church, with the consent of the holy Church of the English nation, and they sent him to the end that he, having received the degree of an archbishop, might ordain Catholic prelates for the churches of the English nation throughout all Britain."‡

We see here that Church and State co-operated advantageously together, and thus the Church was acknowledged an independent corporate body, entrusted with spiritual privileges. That this co-operation produced advantageous results appears from Bede's narrative. Speaking of the Bishop of the Northumbrians, the historian thus proceeds,

* O. dericus Vitalis Lib. V. c. 9.

† Bede E. H. Lib. IV. c. 2.

‡ Bede E. H. Lib. III. 29.

after noticing the frugal living of the ecclesiastics, and their liberality :—"The king himself, when opportunity offered, came only with five or six servants, and having performed his devotions in the church, departed. But if they happened to take a repast there, they were satisfied with only the plain and daily food of the brethren, and, required no more, for the whole care of those teachers was to serve God, not the world, to feed the soul, and not the body.

"For this reason the religious habit was at that time in great veneration; so that wheresoever any clergyman or monk happened to come he was joyfully received by all persons as God's servants; and if they chanced to meet him on the way, they ran to him, and, bowing, were glad to be signed with his hand, or blessed with his mouth. Great attention was also paid to their exhortations; and on Sundays they flocked eagerly to the church, or to the monasteries, not to feed their bodies, but to hear the Word of God; and if any priest happen to come into a village, the inhabitants flocked together to hear from him the word of life; for the priests and clergymen went into the village on no other account than to preach, baptise, visit the sick, and, in few words, to take care of souls; and they were so free from worldly avarice, that none of them received lands and possessions for building monasteries, unless they were compelled to do so by the temporal authorities, which custom was for some after observed in all the churches of the Northumbrians." [Bede, E. H. Lib. III. 26.]

When Theodore arrived in England as archbishop, he took an early opportunity of visiting the different parts of the islands, attended by Hadrian. "Both of them were well read, both in sacred and in secular literature, and gathered a crowd of disciples, and there daily flowed from them rivers of knowledge to water the hearts of their hearers; and, together with the books of Holy Writ, they also taught them the arts of ecclesiastical poetry, astronomy, and arithmetic. A testimony of which is that there are still living at this day* some of their scholars, who are as well versed in the Greek and Latin tongues as in their own in which they were born. Nor were there ever happier times since the English came into Britain; for their kings, being brave men and good Christians, they were a terror to all barbarous nations, and the minds of all men were bent upon

* Bede concludes his E. Hist. at A.D. 731.

the joys of the heavenly kingdom of which they had just heard; and all who desired to be instructed in sacred readings had masters at hand to teach them. From that time also they began in all the churches of the English to learn sacred music, which till then had been only known in Kent." [Bede E. H. Lib. IV. 2.]

In A.D. 673 Theodore assembled a council at Hertford, which made some decrees relative to the discipline of the Church. The first canon relates to Easter, and decides that the festival should be kept on the Lord's Day, after the fourteenth day of the moon, in the first month. There is another "concerning increasing the number of bishops in proportion to the number of the faithful," on which they had a conference, but determined nothing as to this point.

It is unnecessary to do more than allude to the great change in the religious state of Northumberland, in consequence of King Edwin's successor's apostasy. During the reign of Edwin the Church had made considerable progress, in consequence of his successors not co-operating with the Church, the State retrograded while the Church was discouraged. Paulinus, in consequence, left his See and went to Rochester, where he died bishop. After a time the Church recovered from her depression under King Oswald.

It was the original intention to have two archbishops and twelve suffragans under each. Various circumstances hindered this intention being carried into effect. Wilfrid, in all probability, was aware of it when he was put into the See of York on the removal of Chad. After some years (probably ten), Theodore took steps to increase the number of bishops, probably in consequence of decisions at a synod. The subject was brought forward at the synod at Hertford, but, as we are informed, nothing determined. However, Theodore divided Wilfrid's diocese, which was resisted by Wilfrid, and it ended in an appeal to Rome. In the meantime, for opposing this measure, Wilfrid was deposed, and King Ecgfrid supported the decision of the Church by interfering in regard to temporalities. Wilfrid was thrust out of the See. He arrived at Rome late in A.D., 679. There had been, previous to his arrival, an assembly of advisers of the Pope preparatory to the sixth General Council summoned by the Emperor at Constantinople. At this meeting a decision was given in favour of Theodore, but when Wilfrid arrived, there was either an adjournment of the previous consistory, or a distinct one. There are various opinions on this point; however, it is of little consequence. The fact was a contrary

decision. Wilfrid returned home, but, notwithstanding the decision in his favour, Theodore still refused compliance with the decision of the council. The Archbishop of Canterbury disregarded the authority of the Bishop of Rome, and was supported by the King of Northumberland. Thus the union of Church and State resisted the authority of the Pope. The union of Church and State keeps back the encroachments of any foreign power, whether civil or ecclesiastical. One device of the enemy, when he sows tares, is to promote a misunderstanding between Church and State, and it is remarkable, though not suspected by many, that the secret abettors of the Church of Rome promote, as far as they can, a separation of Church and State as they term it, for by alienating the protection of the State they are persuaded that the Church is more likely to be brought in conformity with another power. It is true that the Church has at different times exceeded proper bounds in regard to the position of the State, while at other times the State has depressed the Church. This is no more an argument for disestablishment than the occasional undue outbursts of temper either on the part of husband or wife should be a plea for immediately dissolving the bonds of matrimony. In both cases there wants an equilibrium of proper temper, which can only be acquired by God's gracious influence through that Church to which the Saviour has given especial promises. The case of opposition to the subdivision of Wilfrid's diocese was not the only instance which Theodore had to deal with. The kings of Mercia opposed Theodore in his plan for increasing the number of bishops. When Theodore deposed Winfrid for not acquiescing in the division of the diocese, the diocese remained undivided, probably through King Etheldred's opposition, though Sexulf was put in the place of Winfrid. The struggle seems to have been on account of the metropolitan power of the See of Canterbury, which was distasteful to the kings of Mercia. Although the King opposed Theodore in a partition of the diocese, yet he brought Wilfrid to a diocese in Mercia when ejected from York. Such collisions as these show the necessity of some bond of union between the various Churches which are not expected to act in opposition to each other.

We may notice the inconvenience arising from a bishop being metropolitan over dioceses in several kingdoms, which appears to have been the case in this period of our history. If any of those kings should be at war, or even if there

should be a difference or dispute between them, the metropolitan bishop might be suspected of taking a partial view of the case. But since England is now under one regal government, the inconveniences just alluded to are not likely to arise. The difficulty in the present day arises on so many sects separating from the Church. Each, no doubt, would like to be supreme, but it would appear so very inconsistent to put themselves forward for such advancement, so they clamour for separation of Church and State as the primary point to accomplish. What they mean by such separation it is difficult to understand. Why they should at first institute an inquiry into the revenues or endowments of churches it is difficult to imagine, unless they wish to deal with the property of the Church in a way that is not sanctioned by the constitution and law of this country in regard to property in general. What have the endowments to do with the separation of Church and State? The Church might be in any way disconnected with the State, and retain its revenues for the purpose intended by the donors. If confiscation of the revenues of the Church is not intended, why first of all, propose an inquiry by Parliament into every particular concerning them? When there is prospect of the removal of certain liabilities, to which property in any case may be liable, self-interest is sure to actuate many in deciding on the measure. How was it at the Reformation in this country? The great number of impropriations, *i.e.*, Church property in the hands of laymen, afford a sufficient answer. Some think that no one body or party or religious sect should be preferred before the rest—that all should be treated alike. This may seem very plausible, and seem to be dealing fairly to all; so it would if all had an equal claim on our support. Among so many different sects, opposed to each other in several respects, it cannot be supposed that all are right. The claims of Christianity are not to be set aside. We are not at liberty to choose some articles of the Creed, and reject the rest, nor are we at liberty to select some of the commandments, and reject the rest. Christianity admits of nothing of the kind. The whole truth, as revealed to us, we are expected to accept. If, then, any sect disregards a material point of Christianity, that sect cannot say that it should be equally regarded with that Christian body which neither adds to nor even takes away from the truth.

Besides, it is a material point to consider, whether the body which puts itself forward for acceptance is the mere offspring of the present age, or connected by the rules of

succession with the origin of the society. If we take this view of the Church of England, we are more likely to establish its claims as superior to those that have separated on some frivolous pretence, and cut themselves off from the original body.

We have little more to say illustrative of our subject on the Roman Council about British Affairs, A.D. 679, and the Synod at Rome concerning Wilfrid, A.D. 680. Whether these were two sessions of the same synod, or two distinct synods, it is not material to inquire. The Bishop of Rome's authority in England, at all events, was not paramount. Theodore disregarded the instructions given at Rome, and the civil power in Northumberland co-operated with him. In A.D. 680 we have Theodore presiding at a council at Hatfield, to settle the faith of the Church, and preserve the English Church from the heresy of the Monothelites.* This synod was appointed by Theodore, apparently with the approbation of several kings, none of whom attended. The council was purely an ecclesiastical one. The several kingdoms co-operated with the archbishop, and their bishops attended the synod, who "all unanimously agreed in the Catholic faith" (Bede, E. H., VI. 7). At this synod they received the decisions of the *first five* general councils, the epistles of Ibas, and Roman synod under Martin I. (A.D. 642).

There were individuals present, besides bishops, such as John the arch-chanter, who came from Rome by order of Pope Agatho, together with Abbot Biscop, these, with the rest, signed the declaration of the Catholic faith.† This was a synod of bishops, although others were present, and the narrative given by Bede does not place them all on the same footing. The archbishop presided, and the bishops sat with him "Præsidente ipso Theodoro gratia Dei Archiepiscopo Britanniae insulae, et civitatis Dovernis una cum eo sedentibus cæteris Episcopis Britanniae insulae, viris venerabilibus," but we find the position of John and Biscop, and others, differently represented; they were present, not sitting with the bishops "Adfuit huic Concilio Johannes Archicantor Ecclesiae St. Petri Romæ." Those present, signed the instrument committed to writing by the authority of the synod, but we do not find their names in the instrument as sitting with the bishops.

Among the laws made by Ine, King of the West Saxons, there were several ecclesiastical laws. These were probably

* *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.*

† Bede, E. H. VI. 18.

made during the vacancy of the See of Canterbury after the death of Theodore, which continued about three years. We may observe a disposition on the part of the states to co-operate with and support the Church by giving protection and assistance. At the meeting held by Ine, A.D. 693, the measures under consideration were mostly of a civil character. The faith of the Church was not the subject of discussion, as not long previously at Hatfield, where the council consisted of bishops. By the laws of Ine, the Church received protection on behalf of its members and temporalities, equally with the State. It appears from Canon 7 that the bishop sat on the temporal bench, with the laymen. There is mention of Church-Scot which is enforced by a penalty. [Can. 4.]

As soon as Wihtred, King of Kent, began to reign, he called a council at Becanceld, A.D. 692, to grant, or, perhaps, to renew grants, to the churches which had suffered considerably in the late wars with the West Saxons. This was not a synod, or council, to settle spiritual matters connected with the Church, but that the king might give his sanction and support to the restoration of the churches and their privileges. Those who have no scruple to disregard the denunciations of sacrilegious conduct, may learn the feeling which was not singular on that point. In the grant of privileges Wihtred said:—"I have learned that no layman ought of right to go to any church, or any of the possessions thereunto belonging, and to take free quarters there for himself, his guards, or retinue, or to demand any tribute from it."* The Latin, perhaps, may convey the meaning more clearly:—"Ideo ego Withredus Rex terrenus a Rege regum compunctus, zelo rectitudinis accensus ex antiqua traditione sanctorum Patrum et mandatis didici non esse licitum alicui ex laico habitu sibi ipsi usurpare vel ad se trahere (quasi suam propriam possessionem) quod antea fuerat Domino concessum et cruce Christi firmatum atque dedicatum: quia scimus et veraciter extat, ut si quid semel acceperit homo de manu alterius in propriam polestatem nullatenus, sine ira et ultione illud dimiserit impunitus," in other words "Laici non abstrahant nec possideant Deo concessa." Let us notice what King Wihtred says on the appointment of bishops: "When it happens that bishop, or abbot, or abbess, departs this life, let it be notified to the archbishop, and let such an one as is worthy be chosen with his advice and consent, and

* Spelman I. 189.

let the archbishop make inquiry into the life of the man that shall be chosen into so sublime an office" (*Grant of Privileges*, 3). Here the king said nothing about intimation being made to himself of the death of a bishop; it is clear he considered that the election of bishops rested with the Church.

The laws of King Wihtred, called *Dooms Ecclesiastical*, were decreed at Berghamsted, A.D. 696. There is no precedent from that assemblage for the admission of laymen to Convocation, for the nature of the business transacted was of a civil kind, such as might tend to promote good order and proper conduct in the State. There is something which reminds us of the usual proceedings in Parliament, when taxes are imposed. The consent of those who are to be taxed is considered requisite, and their attendance essential, with all appearance of fairness and justice. So when Wihtred's *Dooms Ecclesiastical* were passed, it was but right that, before freedom from taxes was granted to the Church, those should be present who had to pay the taxes, and consent to exonerating the Church. The preface, after naming several who were present, thus proceeds: "Every order of the Church in that nation of the same mind with the people subject to them were present and treated. And there the great men devised these *Dooms* with the consent of all, and make additions to the righteous usages of the Kentish, as it is hereunder said and declared."*

After speaking of Hedda, Bishop of the West Saxons, Bede thus proceeds, showing that the division of a diocese was a subject for settlement at a synod:—"Upon his death the bishopric of that province was divided into two dioceses. One of them was given to Daniel, which he governs to this day; the other to Aldhelm, wherein he most worthily presided for four years. Both of them were well instructed, as well in ecclesiastical affairs as in the knowledge of the Scriptures." "Whilst they were bishops it was decreed in a synod that the province of the South Saxons, which till then belonged to the diocese of the city of Winchester, where Daniel then presided, should also have an episcopal See and a bishop of its own. Eadbert, at that time abbot of the monastery of Bishop Wilfrid, of blessed memory, called Selsey, was consecrated their first bishop. On his death

* Spelman Vol. I. 194. Nec non cæteri ordines Ecclesiastici illius gentis qui cum vitis utique militaribus humanissime et communi omnium assensu has leges decrevere Cantuariorumque juribus et consuetudinibus prout sequitur addendas edixers.

Eolla succeeded in the bishopric. He also died some years since, and the bishopric has been discontinued to this day.* This last synod was held A.D. 707. About this period we have the following to a document granting freedom from taxes to the Church:—"Ego Whitredus Rex Cantiae ad omnia suprascripta et confirmavi atquea medictata propria manu signum sanctae crucis pro ignorantia literarum expressi."—A.D. 700.

From the answers of Ecgbriht, Archbishop of York, it appears that the monastic system prevailed in his district, especially in Northumberland, while there was want of bishops, which Bede notices in his letter to Ecgbriht. The date of these answers is usually fixed A.D. 734, the year in which Bede died. There seems to have been a better understanding between the civil and spiritual powers in this age than there was some years afterwards. From Ecgbriht's answer to Question 8 we find the province of each defined: "The punishment of them who offend more or less in the Church belongs not to them who are without (1 Cor. ix. 18). But if any ecclesiastics have committed any crime among laymen, as murder, fornication, theft, it is thought fit that they be, by all means, seized by the seculars against whom they have offended, unless the Church be pleased to make satisfaction for them."

From the answer to question 10 it appears that the bishops had courts distinct from the temporal, yet it is probable that in Northumberland, as in other districts, the bishops sat in the temporal courts. From answer to question 14 we have a clear exposition of the object of sanctuary afforded by the Church, which was a means of co-operating with the civil power in the reduction of crime. The Church expected confession, which enabled it to fix the penance, which freed the criminal from secular punishment. If any came concealing their crimes they had no claim to sanctuary, and, if found out, were rejected, and left to the civil jurisdiction. "If he deceived the Church, and fraudulently concealed his crime, it is resolved that the Church have power to dismiss him, or, if she please, to make satisfaction for his crime. But we desire that they who are in this condition be torn from the Church doors by force, and that no time for the future be allowed to the Church to abscond such as are guilty after the day of trial."

The Canons of Ecgbriht, usually bearing date A.D. 740,

* Bede E. H. lib. V. 18.

show that the Church at that period had made considerable advance. They were building parish churches (1); tithes offered (2); the Lord's Prayer and Creed were to be taught the people (6); prayer for the emperor (7); no priest to sue in the secular courts, relinquishing his own law (16). There is one deserving attention in the present day,—“That churches founded of old be not deprived of their tithes, or any other possessions, in order to give them to new oratories.”

At a synod at Cloveshoo, at which Ethelbald, King of the Mercians, presided, A.D. 742, the privileges of King Whitred of exemption from taxes to the kingdom of Kent were extended to the kingdom of Mercia, “except expedition, and building of a bridge or a castle.”*

Whoever attentively reads an account of the various synods that have taken place, may soon distinguish the difference between a pure ecclesiastical synod, and one in which affairs were transacted for State purposes, in which laity and clergy had a common interest. This peculiarity may be observed, in some which I have already noticed, as well as in the assemblage at Cloveshoo, A.D. 747. This was a provincial synod, not national, for no Northumbrian bishops were present. Laymen do not appear to have taken any part, not even the King Ethelbald, who, from the narrative, appears to have been a mere spectator. It is incidentally noticed that he was present. Had he taken a part in the proceedings, his name would have been arranged with the list given of those who were present. “Anno Dominicæ incarnationis DCCXLVII. Indictione XV. Anno hoc regni Ædibaldi Regis Merciorum (qui tunc aderat cum suis Principibus ac ducibus). XXXII.”

Although some priests were present at this synod, it does not appear for what purpose, or in what capacity; it is probable that they might be attendants on bishops, who are not supposed to go alone on any public occasion. Their presence does not support the assertion of some, who advocate their attendance at a Provincial Synod, for the purpose of taking a part in the proceedings. There is a disposition in the present day, to put together Convocation and the Provincial Synod, to consider matters which exclusively belong to the decision of the latter. “It was determined, in the twenty-fifth head, that bishops coming from synods, assembling the priests, abbots, and chiefs within their parish, and laying before them the injunctions of the synod, give it in charge

* Spelman, Vol. I., 230.

that they be kept.”* From this, priests are not supposed to be present, if otherwise, why take measures to inform them of the proceedings?

We come next to the Legatine Canons at Cealchythe, A.D. 785, which were drawn up by two bishops, who came over from Rome by Pope Adrian. Their names were Gregory Bishop of Ostia, and another bishop, called Theophylact. Without entering further into the history connected with these proceedings, I shall turn at once to the canons themselves. In the 1st Canon the faith of the Nicene Council and of the six general councils is enjoined. It has always been the aim of the Bishop of Rome to prevent the union of Church and State. In the 10th Canon bishops in their councils were forbidden to judge secular matters.

The union of Church and State was somewhat disturbed, when more kingdoms than one were subject to the same archbishop. This was the case when Offa, King of the Mercians, raised Lichfield to an archiepiscopal See, which was relinquished in a short time. The final settlement of the primacy at Canterbury took place A.D. 803, about six or seven years after the death of Offa.†

In A.D. 806 there was a synod at Cealc-hythe, at which Kenulf, King of the Mercians, was present, but the account we have is such as does not give him a prominent place at the synod. We are not told that the king presided, but Wulfred the Archbishop—“*Praesidente vero Wulfredo Archiepiscopo, caeterisque adsedentibus Australibus Anglorum Episcopis.*” After enumerating the bishops present, we have the king’s presence, at the end, noticed in connection with the date. It does not appear that he took any part in the conference, but it is noticed that “the presidents of the sacred order were treating with the abbots, priests, and deacons concerning what was necessary and useful for the Church.” “*Porro Coenulfi Regis Merciorum anno xx qui tunc tempore praesens adfuit cum suis Principibus Ducibus et optimatibus dum undique sacri ordines, praesides cum Abbatibus Presbyteris, Diaconibus pariter tractantes de necessariis et utilitatibus Ecclesiarum.*”‡ It may be observed here, that

* Vicesimo quinto definitum est capitulo; ut episcopi a synodo venientes in propria parochia cum Presbyteris et Abbatibus et Praepositis conventum habentes praecipua synodi servare insinuando praecipiant et unusquisque episcoporum, si quid in sua diocesi corrigere et emendare nequiverit item in synodo coram Archiepiscopo et palam omnibus ad corrigendum insinuet.—Spelman, Vol. I. 251.

† William of Malmesbury, Lib. I. c. 4.

‡ Spelman, Vol. I, 328.

priests and deacons had no deciding voice at the synod, but suggested, from their knowledge and experience, to the presidents of the sacred order, what was necessary for the Church. The only laymen noticed as present were those attendant on the king, viz., Principes, Duces et Optimates, but these were not treated with, concerning what was necessary and useful for the Church. From this synod, we have no precedent for admitting either priests, deacons, or laymen, to take a deciding part at a Provincial Synod, where the doctrines and discipline of the Church are settled. The Parliamentary Convocation is not for such discussions. The admission of laymen into Convocation would interfere with the present Parliamentary representation.

Canon 5 shows how careful they were on the subject of ordination, of which they considered there must be some proof, beyond the mere laying on of hands, by some person called a bishop, whether that person had received authority to do so from those to whom the Catholic Church had previously given the same authority in like manner, and by the hands of the same order of persons, or not. The Scottish race were excluded by this canon from ministering in the Province of Canterbury, and the reason is given, "because we are not certain how, or by whom, they were ordained"—"quia incertum est nobis, unde et an ab aliquo ordinentur." From this period, until the reign of Alfred, few synods of any importance were held in regard to the internal state of the Church, in consequence of the unsettled state of the country through the incursion of the Danes. There is an allusion to the state of the country in the Royal Charter, granted at a council at Winchester, A.D. 855. "In the name of our Lord, who reigneth for everlasting. Whereas, in our days, we do perceive that evil times are impending the flames of warfare, the plunder of our treasures, most cruel depredations by enemies who lay waste far and wide, and by barbarous and pagan nations, with multiplied tribulations, to afflict us even unto death for our sins."*

A.D. 855. "This year," says the Saxon Chronicle, "heathen men, for the first time, remained over winter in Shepey; and the same year King Æthelwulf gave by

* Ingulph—"Regnante Domino nostro in perpetuum, dum in nostris temporibus bellorum incendia et direptiones opum nostrarum nec non et vastantium crudelissimas hostium depredationes barbararum paganarumque nationum, multiplices tribulationes ad affigendum nos pro peccatis nostris usque ad internecionem, tempora cernimus incumbere periculosa."

charter the tenth part of his land throughout his realm for the glory of God and his own eternal salvation.”*

By the Laws of King Alfred, A.D. 877, observance of oath and covenant was enjoined. The Church and State co-operated in enforcing observance. The surety was answerable both to Church and State.†

By another, it appears, that when the bishop was unable to attend the county court, there was a deputy, called the King's Priest.‡

King Alfred's and Guthrum's Law Ecclesiastical show a strong inclination to keep Church and State in union. The first canon decrees—“That the peace of the Church, within its walls, and the peace of the king's right hand be equally inviolable.” “Et hoc est primum edictum Ecclesiæ pax inter parietes suos et Regis *Hangrid* semper inconculsa permaneat.”

Guthrum the Dane, who made an alliance with King Alfred, while he had toleration, was expected not to “violate the peace of the Church, and the peace of the king's right hand.” There is a lesson here to law-makers for securing the good conduct of those who are permitted to have toleration and liberty of conscience.

If they had possessions in the country, they were expected to render unto Cæsar the things that were Cæsar's, and unto God the things that were God's.

“If one withhold his tithes, or his Rome fee, or do not pay his light scot, or his plough alms, or deny any ecclesiastical rights, let him pay a mulct among the English, or a fine among the Danes.”—C. 9.§

* Ingulph—“Quamobrem ego Ethelwulphus rex Westsaxonum cum concilio Episcoporum ac Principum meorum consilium salubre ac uniforme remedium affirmantes, consensimus, ut aliquam portionem terrarum hereditariam antea possidentibus omnibus gradibus sive famulis et famulabus Dei Deo servientibus, sive laicis miseris semper decimam mansionem, ubi minimum sit, tum decimam partem omnium bonorum in libertatem perpetuam donari sanctæ Ecclesiæ dijudicavi ut sit tuta et munita ab omnibus secularibus servitutibus, imo regalibus tributis majoribus et minoribus sive taxationibus quæ nos decimas *Winterden* sitque libera omnium rerum remissione animarum et peccatorum nostrorum ad serviendum Deo soli sine Expeditione et pontis extractione et arcis munitione ut eo diligentius pronobis ad Deum sine cessatione preces fundant quo eorum servitutem in aliqua parte levigamus.”

† “Quod si quisquam alius pro eo fidem dederit, poenas fidejussionis violatæ dato, et fidei læsæ supplicium quod ei fuerit a sacerdote imperatum subito.”

‡ Hoc ipsum si præsentem alio quocunque in locum ejus substituto aut coram Sa cerdote regio evenierit 30 solidis culpa pensator.” [15.]

§ Spelman, Vol. I., 377. Et siquis decimam contra teneatur reddat Lashlite cum Dacis Witam cum Anglis. Si quis “Romfeih” superteneat, reddat Lashlite cum Dacis Witam cum Anglis. Si quis non reddat symbolum luminis reddat Lashlite cum Dacis, Witam cum Anglis. Si quis Dei rectitudines aliquas dis forciat reddat Lashlite cum Danis Witam cum Anglis.

In King Alfred and Guthrum's Laws Eccles. we have ordeal noticed, and restriction put on it on festival days and solemn fast days. This was A.D. 878, but, 47 years afterwards, it had so increased, that a considerable proportion of the law, enacted A.D. 925, by King Ethelstan, related to it. How its importance and practice increased it is not our province to inquire. At all events, the prevalence of ordeal increased during the residence of the Danes in this country. There were some other councils held about this time, by King Ethelstan, but the precise dates are not ascertained. The instructions given at them are distinct from those at Greatlea, —at least, the different reports have not been preserved together. The former are only in Latin, while the latter are in Saxon. There is one observation deserving attention in the present day, as some desire the removal of the bishops from the House of Lords, and also, if we may judge from the plans suggested for Church reform, by such devices as tend to lower the character and influence of the clergy among the educated classes. It is this: "And it is necessary for all Christians, that they love right and condemn wrong; and that they who are promoted to sacred orders, do always advance what is right, and depress what is wicked. Therefore bishops ought to be present with secular judges in their judicatures, that they may not, if possible, permit any sprouts of pravity to spring up."*

In consequence of the laws made at Greatlea not being observed, another council was held, to adopt decisive measures, A.D. 926, or thereabouts. In the Canons of Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 943, we have instructions to bishops and priests. In Canon 8th we have a doctrine very different from what was put forth by the Church of Rome in after ages:—"Therefore we ought to look to it, brethren, that there be concord and unanimity between bishops, and princes, and all Christian people; that there be everywhere unity and peace to the Churches of God, nay, that the Church be one in Faith, Hope, and Charity, having one head, which is Christ, whose members ought to help and mutually love each other, as He Himself says, in this shall all men know, &c."†

* Spelman, Vol I., 405. "Christianis autem omnibus necessarium est, ut rectum diligant et iniqua condemnent et saltem sacris ordinibus evecti, justum semper erigant et prava deponant. Hinc debent episcopi cum seculi judicibus interesse judiciis ne permittant si possint ut illius aliqua pravitatum germina pullulaverint."—C. 11, A.D. 928.

† Spelman, Vol. I., 417. "Ideo prævidendum est fratres ut sit concordia et unanimitas inter episcopos et Principes omnemque populum Christianum, ut

In the 10th Canon we see the impression there was respecting tithes, which we were told "peculiarly belong to God." At this time, as well as at Calcuith, A.D. 785, about 158 years previous, there was a prevalent opinion that their payment exempted from almsgiving. In the latter council, A.D. 785, as well as this, the decision was that they should "give alms out of the nine parts." About A.D. 944, King Edmund's Laws Ecclesiastical were passed at a synod in London. At this synod there were present the Archbishop of Canterbury (Odo), the Archbishop of York (Wulfstan), besides very many other bishops. Laymen were present, (*Laiconun cœtum*), this synod partook more of a civil character than ecclesiastical. The good order of society was to be consulted, as well as some temporality affecting the Church, payment of tithe, church scot and alms-fee, is enjoined while it pronounced, "That every bishop repair God's house in his own (See), and remind the king that all God's churches be well provided, for which we have great occasion. C. 5. *Episcopus omnis suis ipsius sumptibus domum Dei instaurato Regemque de reliquis sacris ædibus (id quod valde est necessarium) composite ornandis commoneto.*"

As Northumberland was a distinct kingdom, and probably under a Danish king, there is no wonder that laws should be made, apart from legislation for the rest of England. These laws were made about A.D. 950, and partake more of a temporal than ecclesiastical character, besides it is apparent that the civil power attempted to reduce the Church to a compliance with state regulations,* although the civil and ecclesiastical judicatures were distinct. Canon 5.—"If a priest lay a cause before laymen which he should lay before ecclesiastics, let him pay twelve ore." The acknowledged antiquity of Elfric's Canons, is a sufficient excuse for alluding to them, without noticing the different opinions that have been entertained, or the precise person to whom they are ascribed. They show what we want, something of the state and position of the Church about A.D. 957. We have instructions in Canon 20 to "pray devoutly for the king and for the bishop, and for benefactors and for all Christian people." The antiquity of these canons appears

sit unitas ubique ecclesiarum Dei, et pax: immo una sit ecclesia, fide, spe et charitate, unum habens caput, quod est Christus: cuius membra se invicem adjuvare, mutuaque caritate deligere debent ut ipse ait. In hoc cognoscant omnes: et reliqua."—C 9, A.D. 948.

* Spelman, Vol. I., 495. "Unusquis que etiam Presbyter XII. inveniat fidei iussore de legibus Sacerdotalibus debite observandis." [2.]

from Canon 22, wherein it is directed, that the chalice be made of pure wood, "not subject to rottenness, and also the patten." This change from silver to wood was, no doubt, occasioned through the incursions of the Danes. We have the head of the State next issuing laws relative to the Church. There seems a co-operation on the part of the king with the Church, which, no doubt, had suffered in temporalities from the Danes. The union of Church and State appears from Canon 7:—"Let resort be made to the hundred court, as hath been ordained in time past. Let the burgh-mote be held thrice a year, the county court twice, and let the bishop be at the county court and also the alderman; and there let each of them put in ure both God's law and the world's law."

The above was enacted about A.D. 958, but in A.D. 960 we have canons made for the regulation of the lives of ecclesiastical persons. The 7th decrees "that no suit between priests be commenced before secular men, but that their equals be arbitrators and umpires; or let them lay their cause before the bishop, if there be a necessity."*

The Council at Eanham, about A.D. 1009, at the command of King Ethelred, was a national one, consisting of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, bishops, abbots, and the important men of the laity. There appears to have been a disposition for mutual co-operation between Church and State, for the recovering of the exercise of the Catholic religion, and for repairing the state of the commonwealth at large. It was for civil and ecclesiastical purposes. Among the provisions and prime decree of the bishops, we find, among other things, it was to "maintain the one Christianity, and earnestly avoid all heathenism, and advance devotion among themselves, and affect peace and unity, and faithfully obey one royal lord, and guard him duly and trustely."

We thus read, in the 9th Canon, "Let every church be in the protection of God, and of the king, and of all Christian people. And let the protection of the church, within its own walls, and the protection of the king's hand, be equally inviolable. And let no man, from henceforth, bring a church into servitude, nor unrighteously make merchandise of a church, nor turn out a church-thane without the bishop's consent."†

* Spelman, Vol. I., 448. Docemus etiam ut inter Sacerdotes non sint lites sive iurgia nec ad arbitrium secularium deferantur; sed vel a paribus suis sint composita, vel (si opus fuerit) ad episcopum promoventor.

† Spelman, Vol. I., 517. Fruatur unaquæque ecclesie pace Dei, pace Regis

From the last sentence, patrons had not power to turn priests out of their livings; the canon was passed, with the consent of the State, to prevent such a step.

In the time between the last council and the one now under notice—the space of about five years—the country was in a sad state through the Danes. Ethelred retired to Normandy for protection. Some time after his return there was a council, A.D. 1014, at which there was a recognition of his authority.

Canon 1. “That, in the first place, the one God, beloved and honoured above all things, and that all men obey their king as their ancestors (did when) they did it best, and together with him defend his kingdom.” It is remarkable that so many canons at this council should be in support of the rights of the Church. It is foreign to our purpose to enter upon particulars of any misunderstanding that there may have been between Church and State. This probably contributed, in some measure, to the confusion; and union was requisite for repelling the Danes. At all events, from this, as well as other portions of history, we see that a good understanding and mutual co-operation between Church and State contributes materially to the comfort of the community, in regard to their position both in Church and State. Sometime between the death of Ethelred, A.D. 1016, and the death of Canute, A.D. 1036, the laws ecclesiastical of King Canute were enacted.

We find an admission in these laws, as well as in most laws previously enacted, to the effect that, it is not good a nation should be without a public profession of religion. It was decreed to this effect: “That God’s churches have peace and protection, and be duly frequented to the health of our souls and for our own benefit. Every church is, of right, in Christ’s own protection; and everyone that belongs to Christ hath great occasion to understand the great value of this protection. For God’s protection is most to be desired and regarded of all others: the king’s in the next place. It is most just that the protection of the Church, within its own wall, and that given by the hand of a Christian king be ever inviolate, and let him who greatly breaks either of them suffer the loss of lands and life, unless the king will pardon him.” Canon 4th thus begins: “It rightly

et pax omnium Christianorum. Sit pax uniuscujusque ecclesiæ intra parietes et Pax manu regis data usquequaque sit inviolata.

Nemo dehinc in posterum ecclesiæ servitium imponat; nec clientelam ecclesiæ injuriis afficiat nec ministrum ecclesiæ ejiciat inconsulto episcopo.

concerns all Christian men to observe the peace and protection which belongs to every holy thing, and person, and God's hallowed house."

Canon 8. "Let God's rights be duly paid with diligence every year." Among these laws, as well as in laws enacted several hundred years previous, Sunday markets and county courts on a Sunday are forbidden, and, in some cases, a stricter observance of the Lord's Day enjoined.

20. "Come on, let us do as we desire to teach, let us be faithful and true to our Lord, and ever defend His honour with all our might, for whatever loyalty we perform to our right Lord, we do it all to our own benefit, for God will be faithful to such. Every lord, also, has, to a great degree, his advantage in this, viz., that he duly keep faith with his men."

There are 80 laws of King Canute bearing date about A.D. 1018.

In the 8th: "The same with the seventh law of King Edgar, that the bishop should sit upon the bench with the alderman." There is one (29th) deserving the attention of modern times: "All people ought, of right, to assist in repairing the church." We have a code of laws ecclesiastical, supposed to be those of Edward the Confessor, whether formally enacted at a council in his time, or collected sometime afterwards as those which guided the administration in his time, we stop not to inquire. Their antiquity is undoubted. The date is attributed to A.D. 1064. In the first, it is declared, "That, by her (*i.e.*, the laws of the Holy Mother Church), the king and kingdom stand upon a solid foundation."* Whether or not the bishop sat in the civil court at this time, it is not very material to inquire. There was a good understanding between the Church and the civil power. In the third we have the following:—"Let the bishop, in his own court, prosecute any man that has incurred a forfeiture to him. Yet if any one, out of arrogance, will not be brought to satisfaction in the bishop's court, let the bishop notify him to the king; and let the king constrain the malefactor to make satisfaction where the forfeiture is due; that is, first to the bishop, then to himself; so there shall be two swords, and one sword shall help the other." Such was the feeling of preference to the Church as the only solid support of the State, that we have a Canon, the 4th, thus—

* "A legibus igitur sanctæ matris Ecclesiæ sumentes exordium, quoniam per eam Rex et regnum solidum subsistendi habent fundamentum, leges, libertates et pacem ipsius concionati sunt." [1] A.D. 1064.

"Wherever pleas are held in the court of the king, or of any other person, if the bishop's messenger come thither and open a cause that concerns Holy Church, let that be first determined. For it is fit that God be everywhere honoured before others."

Previous to the conquest, before the Pope had put forth his interference so prominently, the Church and civil powers worked more harmoniously together, and it answered better, both for the interests of religion, and the happiness and welfare of the State. After the conquest there was considerable change in the administration of civil and ecclesiastical affairs. It is foreign to our purpose to enter on any lengthened history of the results of the conquest, and the history from that period to the Reformation. We can only allude to it, and deduce from the canons of the Church and State documents what information we can relative to either good or bad results from proceedings between Church and State. William I. might seem, at one time, to incline to the assistance of the Court of Rome, at another period to act independently of it. The Conqueror, like many in the present day, was keen enough to see how he could avail himself of support.

During the Anglo-Saxon times, when the authority of the prince was not subject to the influence of the Church of Rome, nor politically constrained to act under the influence of the Pope, the concurrence of the king's, or civil power, secured a better administration of affairs in Church and State.* In after ages, when the Pope seemed to dictate to and rule over so many different countries or civil powers, there was a danger of his joining one state for the suppression or subjugation of another, at least he might be suspected of favouring one more than another. I think this may have been more than suspected to have been the case, when we examine the political state of Europe, for four or five hundred years after the conquest, which introduced considerable changes, and we find the struggles between the civil and ecclesiastical powers increased in proportion to the increase of the Pope's influence, until England, as a nation, became oppressed, and the spirit of religion declined. Without entering minutely into the history of Lanfranc, Anselm, Becket, and that of several kings, during and subsequent to their history, I shall only refer to such canons as throw light on the transactions

* Wake's Authority, 173.

between Church and State, and the development of the position of the Church, as a body independent of the civil power, possessing the capability of co-operating with the civil government, if essentially Christian, or, if not Christian, possessing a capability of avoiding collision without sacrifice of its heavenly principles. A serious collision might take place, if the plans of some in the present day were promoted, in regard to Convocation. I think a great deal of the clamour for reform of Convocation, which mainly proceeds from some of the Clergy, arises from ignorance of the history of Convocation, and not sufficiently noticing the distinction between the Parliamentary Convocation for State purposes, and the Provincial Synod for spiritual. As for the introduction of laymen into Convocation, it might be an infringement of the constitution, affecting Parliamentary representation, and in regard to the spiritual affairs of the Church, it would introduce an element hitherto unknown.

Very much misunderstanding has taken place in the Church, especially in more modern times, in the spiritual and temporal affairs of the Church not being decided or settled by the proper tribunal, and, in some cases, where the case might be settled by either the Church or the State, one probably has been more lenient and less rigid than the other. It might be well if temporal matters, in which the Church is exclusively interested, could be settled by the ecclesiastical judicature, while disputes in which the Church and others are interested, could be settled in temporals by the State; while the Church decides on doctrinal and spiritual matters. Some disorder and confusion might be prevented if none were allowed to adjudicate on doctrinal and spiritual matters, and even on temporal matters, who were not *bona fide* members of the Church. It is a most inconsistent thing for schismatics, heretics, infidels, and sceptics, to be on a tribunal in deciding any matters affecting the Catholic Church. Dissenters would consider it a strange thing if *bona fide* members of the Church of England should be called upon to settle the disputes among them, affecting the peculiar doctrines of their body, and the management of their internal affairs. Why, then, should disputes affecting the Church of England, in its doctrinal and disciplinary affairs, be submitted to a tribunal to which sceptics, infidels, schismatics and heretics are eligible? When the Church asks for liberation from such a tribunal, it asks for no more than what she is willing should be granted to the various sects that surround us. We will not dwell on those

canons passed A.D. 1070, A.D. 1071, which show, indirectly, that some influence from Rome had been exercised. The king retained his rightful authority, but the influence of Rome was gradually infused, until subsequently it called for extirpation. But we see that one means used to bring the Church under the control of the Bishop of Rome, was to prevent an amicable understanding with the State. It has ever been the course of that Church to divide and conquer. We shall now proceed with some observations on the canons of councils after the conquest. Several were held under Archbishop Lanfranc. One at Winchester, A.D. 1070, another at the same place, A.D. 1071. In A.D. 1075 there was one at London, in the ninth year of the reign of William I. Lanfranc appears to have called and presided in the same. There is no precedent here for the introduction of priests and laymen to take a deciding part at a Provincial Synod, nor at a National Synod. In Canon 5, "To restrain the insolence of some, it was unanimously ordained that none but bishops and abbots speak in council, without licence of the metropolitan."

At this council "fourteen archbishops and bishops subscribe, twenty-one abbots, but Anschtell, Archdeacon of Canterbury, before the abbots." The archdeacon might sign, as a witness, without taking any part in voting or deciding. He might possibly attend in some other capacity besides archdeacon, so as to take precedence of the abbots. A single instance of this kind cannot safely be quoted as a precedent for the admission of the lower clergy.

A.D. 1076 among Lanfranc's Canons, at Winchester, we find the advantage taken by the Normans, to deprive churches and monasteries of their estates. The 6th "we forbid all supplantation of churches," and the 3rd, "It is decreed that no clergyman, either in the city or country, pay any service for his ecclesiastical benefice, but what he paid in the time of King Edward," *i.e.*, secular service, show how oppressed the clergy were by the king and his adherents. Lanfranc, and even the Norman bishops, disapproved of such oppression.

But in A.D. 1085, or thereabouts, King William issued the first mandate for separating the Ecclesiastical Court from the Hundred Court. It suited the views of the Church of Rome to encourage the civil and ecclesiastical powers to be disunited. If there is a good understanding between the Church and State, a foreign influence like that of Rome is kept at a distance. It is foreign to our purpose to dwell upon the disputes in which Anselm and Becket were

involved. These archbishops were sensible of many abuses existing in the Church, and saw clearly that there would be great difficulty in adjusting matters between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities in England. Some allowance may be made in the extreme points to which they might occasionally lean. Some of Anselm's canons, A.D. 1102, show the nature of the abuses. Canon 13: "That tithes be not paid but to the Church," only reminds us of what, in more modern days, is called impropriation; and there is something of appropriation implied in Canon 20: "That monks may not hire farms," and Canon 21, "That monks do not accept (of the impropriations) of churches without the bishop's consent; nor so rob those, which are given them, of their revenues, that the priests, who serve them, be in want of necessaries." These abuses seem to have crept in through *investitures*.

When the Church, as a distinct body, was trampled upon by the civil power, there was recourse to an appeal to the See, which had exercised so much influence; at the first, no doubt, from the best of motives, but in after ages ambition, intrigue, and self-interest, gained an ascendancy, and dictated unprincipled measures in furtherance of its plans. There might well be a rupture, when the Bishop of Rome perceived that his influence and authority were only solicited when it answered the purposes of the kings to do so. This was the case in several instances. William I. secured the countenance of the Pope when he invaded this country, and afterwards he sought his aid to put out the Saxon bishops. Stephen was not satisfied, without confirmation of his title to the Crown at Rome, and Henry II., who had so much contention with Becket, did not object when it answered his own ends, to secure the kingdom of Ireland through Pope Adrian. We need not wonder at such conflicts between Church and State, when the only principle which seemed to influence these kings was their humour, ambition, and self-interest. Such inconsistent conduct might well induce the Popes to insist on the exercise of an authority which they had so often courted and availed themselves of. We may partly judge of the effect of the Popes' power in this country, both in regard to Church and State, and how a rupture between the two may be promoted to the aggrandisement of the Bishop of Rome in the case of Henry I. and Anselm. They both resisted the Pope's authority, which prohibits investiture from princes, as interfering with his own, and also weakened the power of the archbishop as metropolitan. When both Church and State are depressed, the power

which causes that depression is likely to gain the supremacy.

But at the times to which we refer the Church and State were at variance, through the intrigues of a third party, whose invariable practice is, to cause discord through divisions and schism. The king, Henry I., commanded Anselm to consecrate William of Winchester, Roger of Hereford, &c., which he refused on the ground it was contrary to the canons lately made in a council at Rome by Pope Urban. The king enjoined Gerard, Archbishop of York, to consecrate them, who would have complied had not William of Winchester refused consecration from the Archbishop of York, and resigned his staff and ring to the king, which only increased opposition to the king, who at last consented that Anselm should go to Rome, and consult there on the subject. Anselm, for siding with the Pope, was forbidden to come back to England, and the king seized his temporalities. At last the king and Anselm are reconciled, the former disclaimed his right of investitures, the latter consecrated the bishops, and filled up the vacant Sees.* There was a compromise of investitures, A.D. 1107. In the following year the celibacy of the clergy was promoted by a Council (A.D. 1108), at which we are informed that the statutes were ordained by Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Thomas, elect of York, and all the bishops of England, in the presence of Henry I. and his barons. Here is no precedent for laymen taking any deciding part at national and provincial synods, where the doctrines and discipline of the Church are decided; the internal matters of the Church are settled by the Church without interference from any external quarter. Every society has a right to manage its own internal discipline according to the invariable rules of the society, while common sense tells us that members of another society have no right to join in the proceedings.

From Archbishop Corboyl's canons, we may see something of the unsettled state of the Church. A National Synod was held at London, A.D. 1126, at which John de Cremona, Pope Honorius, the Second's Legate, presided. Canon 4, "That no monk or clergyman accept a church-tithe, or any ecclesiastical benefice at the hand of a layman, without the bishop's consent. That every such donation be null, and the offender liable to canonical punishment." Canon 6, "That

* William of Malmesbury, Book 5; also Peter de Blois.

clergymen who have churches or benefices be deprived of them, if they refuse to be ordained (though their bishops invite them to it) that they may live more at liberty. Canon 9 "Let no abbot, clergyman, or layman, eject any one from a church to which he was ordained by the bishop without the bishop's sentence, under pain of excommunication." We are further told, "as soon as these canons or decrees were made, the legate made haste toward Rome, and took along with him the two English Archbishops, William and Thomas, that their dispute concerning the Primacy might be ended in the Pope's Court of Audience."

In A.D. 1127, William Corboyle, Archbishop of Canterbury, and the first Archbishop, who was Legate of the See Apostolical, called a synod at Westminster, and ten English bishops were there; no notice of any abbots, but vast multitudes of the clergy and laity were present. The tumultuousness of the rabble was such, that some matters of business could not be heard. At this assembly the bishops assumed a civil power, which they had no right to do; it was in case of livings being bought or sold, a clergyman was to be degraded, a layman excommunicated and *out-lawed*.

Among abuses, at this time, it appears that tithes were sometimes given, apart from the church to which they properly belonged. Canon 9th: "We charge tithes as the portion of God, to be paid in full; and forbid churches, or tithes, or ecclesiastical benefices, to be given, or taken, by any person, without the consent of the bishop."

We come now to a circumstance which shows how ready the Church of Rome was to avail itself of any opportunity of gaining an ascendancy. In the vacancy of the See of Canterbury, Alberic, Bishop of Ostia, legate from Pope Innocent II., held a National Council at Westminster, at which several canons put forth the power of the Pope. In one case, when clergymen were inhibited, the full restoration of them to their order was reserved to the Pope (Canon 7). In another, the 10th: "Let none but the Pope give him penance at the last, unless in extreme danger of death."

The nation at this time was very unsettled, on account of wars between Maud and Stephen. By Legatine Canons at Winchester, Henry, Bishop of Winchester, the Pope's legate a latere, held a council, A.D. 1143. King Stephen was present. In Canon 1st it was ordained "That none who violated a church, a churchyard, or laid violent hands on a

clerk, or religious person, should be absolved by any except the Pope."

The articles which were enacted at Clarendon, A.D. 1164, were the result rather of a parliamentary assembly than a pure ecclesiastical synod. The disputes which now took place grew out of the separation of the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction by William I. The dispute which arose between Henry II. and Becket, and the result, are well known, and need not be repeated here. There was a struggle between the secular and ecclesiastical powers. Whatever might be Becket's leaning, he, no doubt, perceived a strong tendency towards oppressing the Church. Previous to his time there was dissatisfaction. After all the fair promises made by King Stephen* to the Church, there was a continuance of meddling with the goods of the Church. It was expected that the Church should have the care of temporal, as well as spiritual matters, in the event of a See being vacant; but there was a disposition on the part of the kings to appropriate that guardianship to themselves. The 12th Article of Clarendon shows the disposition towards the Church. "When an archbishopric, bishopric, abbacy, or priory is vacant, it ought to be in the king's hands, and he shall receive all the rents and issues as of his own desmesnes. And when the Church is to be provided for, the king is to send his mandate to the chief parsons of that church, and the election ought to be made in the king's chapel, and by the advice of the king's parsons, whom he shall call for this purpose; and the elect shall do homage and fealty to the king as to his liege lord for his life, and members and earthly honour (with a saving to his order) before he be consecrated."

We must admit, that disputes at home between ecclesiastics, which led to appeals to Rome, tended very much to countenancing the Pope's interference with the affairs of our own Church; and when there were struggles between the civil and ecclesiastical powers, and no settled court of final appeal among themselves, we became the prey of foreigners, both in Church and State. Whether we look in past or subsequent history we shall find that the Church produced a greater spiritual influence, and the State was more peaceable and prosperous when the Church and State kept within their proper jurisdiction and avoided interfering with each other's privileges. Henry II.'s conduct tended to the increase of Papal influence. This is evident from the Pope's Legates

* Spelman Vol. II. 38.

attending the synods of the Church, as in York, A.D. 1195, when Hubert Walter was legate to the Pope, and afterwards when archbishop, in 1200. It is remarkable that, of late, most of the canons enacted are mere acknowledged transcripts from the councils chiefly of the Roman Church, a system more likely to gain a favourable hearing to the claims of the Church of Rome.*

The power of the archbishop as metropolitan became absorbed in that of the legates. There is little to detail from the beginning of the thirteenth century to the reign of Henry VIII., to show the pure and peaceable fruits of union between Church and State, but rather the results of a severance through the influence of the Church of Rome.† Popery appeared in full vigour when the constitutions of Stephen Langton and his successors in the See of Canterbury (under the Pope's Canon Law) regulated our Church. These constitutions were enacted A.D. 1222. Many of them were taken from the decrees of the Lateran‡ Council, A.D. 1216, as if they knew better at Rome how to legislate for the English Church than those who daily observe the points which, as a national Church, require spiritual counsel and advice.

It is gratifying to find one in this age who showed zeal for reformation of abuses, and was eminent for learning and piety. I allude to Archbishop Edmund, who refused to consecrate Richard Wendover, Bishop of Rochester, on account of his unfitness. Through this he incurred the displeasure of the Pope's legate, which led to a journey to Rome, and at last incurred the displeasure of Henry III.§ We have the constitutions, though ignorant where they were enacted, and at what date. His directions respecting confession are worthy of consideration in more enlightened ages. [Canon 16.]

But Henry III. invited Otho, or Otto, to come into England as legate a latere, from Gregory IX., and when a synod was held in London, A.D. 1237, Archbishop Edmund had to take a subordinate place, while Otto presided. This shows the influence gained by Rome.

From Archbishop Boniface's Constitutions, A.D. 1261, we may learn a good deal respecting the struggles between the

* Canons of Archbishop Richards, A.D. 1175; Canons under Hubert Walter, in A.D. 1195 and A.D. 1200, in Spelman, Vol. II.

† Hist. Croyland, A.D. 1208.

‡ Spelman, Vol. II., 181—189.

§ Goodwin in Catalogue of Bishops, page 130.

clerk, or religious person, share the Pope."

The articles which were the result rather of pure ecclesiastical synods than of the place grew out of the tical jurisdiction by between Henry II known, and need struggle between Whatever might a strong tendency

to his time promises made

continuance

It was ex

temporal

being

the

The

the

or

of

near

taken

[3.]

the

difficult

Peckham

Constitutions

Parliament

reign

from

that

or

the

Yet

and

would

council

it

A.D.

had

revoked.

[10.]

secured the liberty of the to the advantage of

's period would

hat "when

fice, the

s, ob

thi

considerable

temporal jurisdiction.

in the reign of Edward I.,

Archbishop Peckham, at a

ing, A.D. 1279, throw some light.

be put up in every cathedral and

to be renewed every Easter.

the Constitutions were these: "And we

charter of our lord, the king, concerning the

anted to the Church and kingdom, to be fixed up

public place within every cathedral and collegiate

fairly and plainly written, that it may be open to the

of all that come in, and let it be renewed at the end of the

year on the eve of Easter or Pentecost, that the old copy, being

taken away, a new one, fairly written, may be put in its place."

We need not dwell on the opposition of Edward I. to

the claims and liberty set forth in Magna Charta, and how

difficult it was to bring him to confirm it. Archbishop

Peckham was constrained to revoke some articles in the

Constitutions, "before the king and his council, in the king's

Parliament at Michaelmas, in the seventh year of the king's

reign at Westminster, Magna Charta was to be taken off

from the doors of churches, and he also declared and granted

that no prejudice be done for the future, neither to the king

or to his heirs, nor to his kingdom of England, by means of

the other articles contained in the Council of Reading."

Yet Archbishop Peckham, who was opposed by the king

and his council, and Parliament, on account of Magna Charta,

would not pull it down from the church doors till he saw the

council, king and Parliament were so averse to his keeping

it up. However, Peckham, in his Constitutions at Lambeth,

A.D. 1281, renewed the articles of excommunication which he

had revoked. [10.]

* Boniface Const., 17; Spelman, vol. II., 305.]

It is unnecessary to
which the temporalities
of the see
the spiritual
into execution.
The King
the

an important work on Church
not have been so decided
question, as Eusebius, Bishop of
present at the Council of Milan
nated.

who was present at some
subject of discussion at
evidence on the close
Church, as well as
his writings. In his

have an account of
Eusebius in Isauria,
between Arianism

results of the
considered by
pistle to the

re of the

those days,

s. Thus

fluence

were

argu-

we

n

the Bishop was on
and raise contribu-
steps taken by Edward I., in
from the clergy. The above,
proceedings, show how matters stood
State: how the influence of Rome inter-
when either Church or State sought its inter-

The constitutions and canons of the Church,
time of the Reformation, partake of much the same

If the Church of England and the civil power had
more united, and had a greater regard for each other,
interest, they might have kept out the interference of a third
party, which, in most cases, would seek its own aggrandise-
ment at the expense of those who called it in.

The privileges of the Church and clergy were set forth
at any time to secure the furtherance of their own plans.
On minute examination of history it will appear, that when
the Pope showed a disposition to secure the privileges of the
clergy, they held with oppression on the part of the State,
that they themselves might gain their ends in other respects.

The extraordinary events which led to a rupture between
Henry VIII. and the Pope need not to be detailed here.
There was a singular crisis on which the Church of England,
and the liberation of this country from the tyranny of Rome,
humanly speaking, depended. The strongest passions of
human nature, exercised in a most unbecoming manner, were
so overruled by divine providence as to result in the praise
of God, while the remainder of wrath was restrained.

"In 1532 and 1533 the king and Parliament of England,
suppressed, by law, various usurped or superfluous privileges
of the Pope. First-fruits, tenths, pensions, annuities, pay-
ments for bulls, palls, censes, portions, Peter's pence, and all
the other pecuniary exactions of the Court of Rome, were
abolished. Bulls of institution to bishoprics, or arch-
bishoprics, and palls, were no longer to be sought from Rome.

The prelates were (as they had been for twelve centuries) to be elected and ordained in England. All appeals to Rome in ecclesiastical causes were suppressed; and every cause was to be determined finally in England, according to ancient custom. All that great multiplicity of licenses, dispensations, compositions, faculties, grants, rescripts, delegacies, by which the pontiffs had so grievously enervated the discipline of the Church, and enriched themselves, was put an end to. Dispensations were in future only to be issued by the Primate of England. Thus the various branches of the papal jurisdiction, most of which had been usurped within the four preceding centuries, were removed. The Church of England acquiesced in these proceedings, well knowing that no principle of justice or of right was infringed by them; and, in fine, as the Pope and his adherents exclaimed loudly against these reforms, and pretended that the papal jurisdiction thus suppressed was founded on "the Word of God," and that it was most impious and wicked to deprive the papal see of any powers which it had possessed, the question was proposed to the bishops and clergy, assembled in the Provincial Synods of Canterbury and York, in 1534, "whether the Bishop of Rome has, in the Word of God, any greater jurisdiction in the realm of England than any other foreign bishop?" It was determined in the negative.

The universities, chapters, monks, friars, throughout the kingdom, declared their assent. One bishop only (Fisher) refused to unite in this general decision of the Church of England; and thus the ordinary jurisdiction of the Pope over England was regularly and lawfully suppressed. The Convocation of the Clergy, in 1531, had acknowledged the king to be "head of the Church of England, as far as it is allowable by the law of Christ;" a limitation by which they intended to save all the spiritual rights and jurisdiction of the Church. In virtue of this office, which Henry seems to have understood in a somewhat different sense from that of the Convocation, he appointed Lord Cromwell his vicar-general and visitor of monasteries.*

It is unnecessary to repeat here the account of the Reformation, as carried on in the reign of Henry VIII., when measures were undertaken to restrain the influence, tyranny, and exactions of the Bishop of Rome. In Burnet's History of the Reformation, and other similar works, we have a minute account of the proceedings at that period, with con-

* Palmer's Eccles. Hist.

siderable documentary evidence. Burnet's remark may throw light on some portions of English Church history. "In the first contest between the kings and the popes the clergy were generally on the popes' side, because of the immunity and protection they enjoyed from that see; but when popes became ambitious and warlike princes, then new projects and taxes were everywhere set on foot to raise a great treasure. The pall, with many bulls and high compositions for them, annates, or first-fruits and tenths, were the standing taxes of the clergy, besides new ones upon emergent occasions. So that they, finding themselves thus oppressed by the popes, fled again back to the crown for protection, which their predecessors had abandoned." (Burnet Ref. Vol. I., Anno 1531.)

It would be foreign to our purpose to recite the various Acts of Parliament restraining the tyranny of the Pope in this country. The circumstances connected with the Act of Submission need not be mentioned. If the Church has been restricted, in some respects, through this Act, we must not forget that it led to the renunciation of the Pope's authority. After the clergy had acknowledged Henry VIII. as supreme Head of the Church of England it was confirmed in Parliament by the statute of 26 Hen. VIII. c. 1.

The object of this work has been to elicit from the Canons of the Catholic Church, in its early days, as well as of the Church of England, (a branch of the Catholic Church,) such facts and inferences as point out how the civil and ecclesiastical powers have co-operated. I think, on a fair examination, it will appear that religion, and the national welfare, flourish the most when Church and State are united, and divested of all rivalry, each acknowledging the other to have its peculiar jurisdiction, without usurping its executive powers. Much of the practical working of the Church and State, whether united or at variance, has been noticed when the various grievances of Dissenters have come under consideration. From the warnings we have had from history, it is clear that Church and State never can work together satisfactorily, unless all spiritual matters be left to the Church for decision, as well as those points of difference on doctrine and discipline, which only affect its own members, while all temporal matters in which secularists and others, are concerned, should be decided in the temporal courts, to which the Church is subject in common with others in the security of personal and real property. As the doctrines of the Church, and its rites and ceremonies, only

affect those who belong to the Church of England, it is not fair that Dissenters or Infidels should be eligible to sit on a tribunal to decide on such matters.

The authoritative documents of the Catholic Church, especially the canons enacted at synods and councils which were assembled in every district where the light of Christianity had penetrated, and at periods at no great distance from each other, are strong confirmatory evidence of the truth of Christianity itself. It must be kept in mind, that most of those very individuals who have left on record the interpretation of sacred Scripture, as received in the early days of the Christian Church, (and some of them also have left historical documents of what then took place,) attended those very synods and councils which have so decidedly settled the vital doctrines of the Church, and incidentally confirmed the truth of the facts which tended to establish the importance of the rites and discipline, which have ever been considered essential to maintain the consistency of the various branches of the Church spread over the world. Sacred literature, soon after the immediate successors of the apostles to the fifth century, abounds with Christian authors, who relate, directly or indirectly, many circumstances connected with canons enacted at various synods or councils. It can hardly be supposed that those canons could be surreptitiously palmed on the Church, or be mere forgeries of a more recent date, when so many writers in the Eastern, Western, and African Churches, have incidentally alluded to them, or directly quoted them; and, in addition to this, it must be kept in mind, that these writers were not confined to one generation, or one century, but are numerous, century after century. And when those theological writers, whose soundness in the faith, and whose opinions have secured the confidence and deference of Christians in all countries and ages to the present day, took a part in the enactment of canons on discipline, we have strong reason to believe that such canons were considered suitable to the wants of the Church, and, at the same time, consistent with the right spirit of Christianity.

I may mention, briefly, some instances, for the consideration of the reader, as a hint to follow up, if need be, the inquiry, in regard to many other writers.

The Ecclesiastical History, by Eusebius, Bishop of

Cæsarea, to A.D. 324, is an important work on Church history, although he might not have been so decided and firm in regard to the Arian question, as Eusebius, Bishop of Vercelli, A.D. 354, who was present at the Council of Milan A.D. 355, where Arianism predominated.

The works of Athanasius, who was present at some councils and synods, and was the subject of discussion at others, abound with much confirmatory evidence on the close association between the canons of the Church, as well as their importance, and the spirit of his writings. In his epistle concerning councils, wherein we have an account of what passed at Ariminum in Italy, and Seleucia in Isauria, there is much which shows the difference between Arianism and the orthodox faith, and the important results of the Council at Nice, A.D. 325. The subject was considered by him of such importance, that he addressed an epistle to the African bishops exposing the changeable nature of the decisions of the Arians. There was, even in those days, considerable communication between distant Churches. Thus the same orthodox spirit seemed to prevail, and influence distant Churches to enact such canons of discipline as were considered desirable for retaining sound doctrine and regulating the external deportment of the believer. We have some fragments of Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, in Socrates and Theodoret, which show that his mind coincided with the decisions at the Council of Nice, A.D. 325.

We have, in the writings of Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, A.D. 423, an account of the Councils of Ephesus, A.D. 431, and Chalcedon, A.D. 451, at which he was present. We see at once that the succession in the Church was kept up, not only by laying on of hands, but by struggles to keep up unity of faith and discipline. By reference to these and many other writers, we may easily discern the mind of the Catholic Church, and observe, that unity of discipline was kept up, no less than unity of faith; and it must be remembered that this sort of procedure extended all over Christendom. We might extend similar observations on the writings of Cyril, of Jerusalem; Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, who was present at the Council of Milan, A.D. 355, and who wrote a book concerning councils. Also, we may mention, Theodotus, Bishop of Ancyra, who was at the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, and whose exposition of the Nicene Creed is still extant. Amphilochius, Bishop of Iconium, was at the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. The above are a few of the many authorities that may be produced.

The same leaven of Divine truth seems to have spread its influence on Churches scattered far and wide. When we find that those who held the Christian faith so firmly and consistently were concerned in enacting canons for the discipline of the Church, we may conclude that those very canons maintain a consistency and possess an authority peculiar to themselves. In the earlier centuries of the Church there was a desire to conform with the received traditions of the Church, as handed down through inspired men and their immediate followers. When the mind of our Blessed Lord and His apostles was fresh in the recollection, we have strong reason to receive these authoritative documents as forms of sound doctrine and discipline, especially if we bear in mind the promises of the Blessed Saviour to be with His Church to the end of the world. But we have not only the evidence of members of the Catholic Church; there is also confirmatory evidence from heretics, and their reluctance, notwithstanding their errors, to be separated from the main body of the Catholic Church. It is evident they looked upon union with the main body as essential.

Whatever errors may have crept into the canons of some churches in after ages, the leading points of doctrine and discipline are acknowledged, and the importance of the canons of the First Four General Councils of the Universal Church has descended through the Church to the present day. The claims of the Church of England do not rest solely on the Apostolic Succession in the Christian Ministry, as practised by the laying on of hands. The canons of the Church show how that ministry has been exercised in the various churches of Christendom, extending over a period of more than 1,800 years, and in every part of the world where Christianity has extended its influence. Canons have been enacted in the Church of England, in every important period of its history, to meet existing circumstances; and it has been universally acknowledged that the decision of the First Four General Councils of the Universal Church should be the basis of canons in more recent days. If our Heavenly Father has such a thing as a Church, under His especial guidance and providence, for the conversion of the world and the maintenance of spiritual life,—if we are persuaded of this, we cannot suppose that a God of order would leave His Church to extend its influence in a disorganized and disorderly manner.

The necessity of a Church under His especial care and guidance is perfectly consistent with everything we behold

in the works of nature, where there is regularity in the habits of the animal creation. Is the Church, then, to be the only body that is to be given up to disorder and disorganization? The 1 Elizab. I. 36, shows what directions are to be attended to by those "who have authority or power to order, determine, or adjudge any matter or cause to be heresy." It is therein stated that only such shall be deemed heresy as heretofore has been determined, ordered, or adjudged to be heresy by the authority of the Canonical Scriptures or by the First Four General Councils, or any of them, or by any other general council wherein the same was declared heresy, by the express and plain words of the said Canonical Scriptures, or such as hereafter shall be ordered, judged, or determined to be heresy by the High Court of Parliament of this realm, with the *assent of the clergy in their Convocation*. We see, then, there must be the assent of the clergy in their Convocation before the decisions of the High Court of Parliament can have any effect in questions of heresy. By this statute it is evident that Convocation is an estate of the realm in spiritual matters, else why should its consent be requisite in passing measures of that kind. This act, in effect, declares that its power in questions of this kind is equal to that of the Lords and Commons. We may regard Convocation, then, as the mouth-piece of the Church in its civil capacity. The provincial synod, which consists of bishops only, has alone power to pass measures, binding on the consciences of Churchmen. A provincial synod, by virtue of the power given by Christ to his Church, can sit at any time without asking consent, but the Parliamentary Convocation, being the creature of the Constitution, cannot sit except when summoned by the crown, in the same way as the House of Lords and Commons, and can only discuss measures laid before them by the crown. This shows that their power is of a civil nature only. If Convocation were the spiritual synod, the restriction put upon its meeting would be contrary to the liberty which Christ has given to His Church.

In the royal declaration, prefixed to the 39 Articles, power is given to Convocation in matters of discipline in these words—"If any difference arise about the external policy, concerning the *injunctions, canons, and other constitutions*, whatsoever thereto belonging, the clergy, in their Convocation, is to order and settle them, having first obtained leave, under our broad seal, so to do, and we, approving their said ordinances and constitutions, provided that none be made

contrary to the laws and customs of the land." "And, out of our princely care, that the Churchmen may do the work which is proper unto them, the bishops and clergy, from time to time, in Convocation, upon their humble desire, shall have licence, under our broad seal, to deliberate of, and to do all such things as, being made plain by them and assented unto by us, shall concern the settled continuance of the doctrine and discipline of the Church of *England*, now established, from which we will not endure any varying or departing in the least degree."

We see from this royal declaration, as well as from 1 Stat. Elizab. I. 36, as previously quoted, that Parliament, without Convocation, has no power to determine the faith or discipline of the Church as at present allied with the State.

The religious advantages we enjoy, from an intimate connection between Church and State, are far greater than what appear if we merely look upon ourselves, as members of the Catholic Church, irrespective of its connection with "kings who are nursing fathers, and queens who are nursing mothers." There cannot possibly be anything wrong or sinful in the Government of a country coming forward in the furtherance of plans for keeping the importance of religion continually before the inhabitants. In any ordinary charity for the relief and comfort of those labouring under bodily disease or infirmity, it is considered more advantageous that a number of benevolent persons should combine, or unite their efforts, whether pecuniary or otherwise, if the usefulness of the institution is to be extended to the public at large. Private and individual efforts may be useful to a certain extent, but the efforts or contributions of a single person, might fall far short of the applications, while others, equally benevolent, might not have an opportunity of indulging their kindly feelings; besides, the means and appliances in a large establishment could be more varied and ready for every emergency. View an established Church in a similar way. If it is right in kings and civil magistrates to adopt a profession of Christianity, it is right, and in accordance with the principles of their religious profession, to embrace every opportunity of extending its benefits, as far as their sphere of influence may extend. What else can be implied in our Saviour's words: "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven" (Matt. V. 16)? Are kings and civil rulers to be an exception, while we are so often reminded that the Gospel is intended

for all nations, and every individual in a nation, for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God? Shall our Saviour say: "Go ye, therefore, and teach *all nations?*" and shall kings and rulers be an exception? or, can it be supposed possible, that civil rulers can be savingly influenced with the spirit of the Gospel, without feeling a desire that others should be brought also under its influence? "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." The object of an established Church tends to the completion of those prophecies, which represent the Christian dispensation as most glorious and triumphant in its results. "Ask of Me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession" "the Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies" (Ps. II. 8; CX. 2). And Isaiah thus describes the Gospel times: "It shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and *all nations shall flow into it*" (Isaiah II. 2).

St. John has recorded language, even, if possible, still more striking, when he says: "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and His Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever" (Rev. II. 15).

There is a disadvantage connected with an established Church, arising from the endowments, which are apt to be looked upon erroneously, as if paid by the State, and therefore liable, at any time, to be taken away, or otherwise disposed of, as Parliament thinks fit. The endowments of the Church are the result of the voluntary system—the free gifts of individuals: and there is no greater right for any one to take them away from the purpose for which they are intended, than there would be in a person, seeing that a neighbour had given a handsome subscription to some charitable institution, and then going up to him, and claiming the gift for another object. Besides, if any gift or property, otherwise acquired, is to be dealt with in this way, there is an end of all security of property whatever.

There is an idea, too prevalent, that if a thing can be accomplished through Parliament there can be nothing wrong. Such a sentiment relaxes the confidence we ought to have one towards another, and thus introduces disorder in a State, which, in all cases, is expected to give security to all

that may be said to belong to us. Wherever such notions prevail, there is a forgetfulness of the tenth commandment. Although Christ's kingdom is not *of* the world, yet it is *in* the world, and intended to extend its gracious influence to the surrounding mass of heathenism and irreligion.

I have alluded to the disadvantages arising from endowments, which hold out a temptation for unprincipled persons to treat them as so much plunder. This is no reason why endowments should be superseded, by a mere temporary supply, to meet the exigencies of the moment. If the Christian pastor's support is to depend on the humour of his congregation, we shall soon find that he must starve in the midst of plenty, or else depart from those who will not "receive him," nor hear his words, "and shake off the dust of his feet" (Matt. X. 14). What a loss there must then be to the community for whose spiritual benefit his ministry was intended? But when there is a provision to secure the permanent ministration of spiritual services, there is no inducement to lower the standard of religious attainments, to suit the whims and fancies of those who are afraid of being righteous overmuch. A disadvantage arising from endowments, is the unpleasantness and difficulties to which the holder is exposed, through political speculators and agitators, who are ready to lay hold of the revenues for any other purpose more agreeable to their interest. But the intrigues of designing men, which are attended with much that is disagreeable, should excite in us a strong desire to evince to the world that the clergy are actuated by motives of a higher and purer order than what are exercised towards us. It seems a strange contradiction to believe that God sent His only begotten Son into the world to turn men from darkness to light, through the instrumentality of the Church, and yet throw impediments in the way of the Church's influence. I am aware that some look upon religion as something sentimental, a mere opinion or sentiment in the mind, and that everyone has a right to think as he feels disposed, without reference to the Church, as the depository of sacred truth. But while so much stress is laid on liberty of conscience, there is too often a disposition to prevent others serving God as they think best. Society in this state must ever be in confusion—it would be a state of anarchy, which is so opposed to everything we see around us, in the laws of nature, whether in regard to the vegetable or the animal world.

There are certain laws which are observed, through what we commonly call instinct, by the lower animals, and this is

apparent in their strict adherence and conformity to certain ways: and shall man be the only created being that raises his head against regularity and subordination? Shall man suppose that he is to be the only being in the universe that can claim exemption from control? Is man to think that his soul is to be under less control than his body, which is subject to the laws of the State, wherever he may be? In a religious point of view, there are many advantages accruing from the union of Church and State, when the provision made by the Church for the edification of its members is sanctioned and supported by the State. If the civil rulers and constitution are regulated by Christian principles, there is abundant provision for securing both spiritual privileges and temporal support. When the Creed of the Church is recognized, there is something for its faithful transmission to posterity, and thus sound Christian doctrines, and what we are to do, as well as believe, are prevented from being blotted out of existence; but if the State interferes with the doctrines and rites and ceremonies of the Church, we know not how soon religion may be banished out of the land. A State cannot be in a healthy condition, in spiritual matters, when it interferes with the spiritualities of the Church, and strives to eliminate out of her services and creeds anything that is expressive of the vital and essential truths which the Church has protected for centuries. An attempt of this sort is certainly an apparent disadvantage to the Church; but when we know that the Church of Christ is the subject of especial promises, and that there has been an especial providence watching, guiding, and controlling the ark of Christ's Church over the waves of this troublesome world, there is encouragement to be guided solely by its doctrines and precepts, without yielding to the enemy of souls in trying to conciliate the schismatic or the heretic, by advocating the doctrine of expediency.

When the Church and State agree in the same truths, and are undeviating in their adherence, a more solid impression is likely to be made on the rising generation, in regard to the importance of religion; but when the civil rulers put forward opinions, and bring into the House of Parliament measures subversive of the discipline of the Church, and such as tend to expunge out of her formularies the vital and essential facts or truths of Christianity, the young and inexperienced are likely to be misled, or to doubt the importance of the Church's teaching. Scepticism and infidelity are apt to spread. The same evils are likely to arise if all

religions should be on the same footing. The different, and often contradictory, forms of Christianity would raise up doubts, and induce some to say, "what are we to believe among so many contradictory statements?" We must, then, acknowledge the importance of unity in the Church, and if the State is in unity on the general principles affecting the Church, there may be union between the two. The Catholic Church is the grand bond of union, and that branch of it established in this kingdom, is the most likely instrument, through the divine blessing, for binding together its members in unity, peace, and concord. When we cast our eye over the various sects which are tolerated in this country we find them all deficient in keeping religion alive, and handing down the faith, in its purity, to succeeding generations. There is no security among any of them for the preservation and permanency of their principles. Recount the number of meeting houses, in which such men as Matthew Henry were accustomed to preach, and where the Saviour Jesus Christ was held forth prominently in His divine character, that are now in the hands of those who deny the divine nature of our Saviour. What bond of union is there among those who call themselves Independents? Their very name implies disunion. There is nothing in their system at all calculated to secure unity of action, when the creed of each congregation may vary, according to the opinions of those laymen who seem to decide on all matters affecting the doctrines and disciplines which their minister is expected to enforce. When you consider, further, the vast number of sects which go under the name of Protestant Dissenters, differing from each other, in some respects very widely, you cannot find among them any one common bond of unity. We may look in vain to Dissent for unity, such as that which is possessed by the Church of England. The latter, though occasionally obscured, has retained and transmitted the light of Divine truth through many centuries, while the principles of Dissent have fluctuated, and are of very recent date. We notice in the Church a system which has preserved the light of the Gospel in its purity—a system which seems to have had the Divine blessing, and a remarkable Providence over it, notwithstanding the attacks of Dissent, which are continually varying in form. If the Church of England should be disestablished, and disregarded by the civil powers, there is that in its system which savours of permanency, and is likely—more likely—to retain its position as a Church than any of those ephemeral sects which

are only adapted to the opinions of the day, which is a peculiarity of the voluntary system, in the modern Dissenting acceptance of the phrase. But when Church and State are united, and do not act in opposition to each other, there is a permanent system for the inculcation of Divine truth, and there always springs up, with such a system, scholastic establishments, at which we may expect our children's children to receive the same sound, religious, classical, and scientific education, calculated to raise the intellect, purify the affections, and exalt the ideas far beyond anything that has had its origin in sectarianism. We may notice, that Popery gained advances in England whenever there was any difference or dispute between the civil and ecclesiastical powers, as well as when divisions and disputes arose within the Church. Divisions have ever been the occasion, which Popery took, to bring the Church under its control.

The observations of Mr. Baxter, the eminent Nonconformist (in his *Collections out of Contzen the Jesuite*, and in his *Defence of the Principles of Love*), on the evils of schism are deserving of notice: "Popery will grow (says he) out of our divisions: thousands have been drawn to and confirmed in it by this means. I am persuaded (says he) that all the arguments in Bellarmine, and other books, have not done so much to make Papists in England as our divisions and multiplied sects." And, in another place, he says, "Who sees not how fair a game the Papists have to play by our divisions?"

We learn from Camden that, as soon as the Puritans, in Queen Elizabeth's time, had caused a schism, Sanders and Harding came into England, and set to work to proselytize any they could to the Church of Rome. I will leave the reader to judge whether or not Popery has gained ground of late years, since Dissent has been on the increase. Schisms and divisions among professing Christians tend, no doubt, very much to the increase of Popery; but what shall we say in reference to the confusion and party spirit which is apt to prevail in the Church of England? It is not a time to be wasted in contending about secondary points when the enemy is attacking the main body. It is ill judgment if soldiers in a battle are quarrelling among themselves, when union is essential, towards repelling the attacks of the enemy. Various causes have contributed towards this want of discipline in the Church Militant.

The self-sufficiency, insubordination, and erroneous views of toleration have infused themselves so much among the

unguarded members of the Church, together with superficial instruction, that erroneous views on the interpretation of Sacred Scripture have been gaining the increase. In reasoning with such, on Scriptural interpretation, there is the greatest difficulty. It is a common thing to believe nothing but what is formally and pointedly commanded by the sacred text, and they more especially argue in this way in reference to the discipline and ceremonies of the Church. This was not the original way of thinking when the Non-conformists commenced their career. Calvin himself has taught us a different lesson in his *Instit. lib. IV. c. 10, s. 30*. He says—"That Christ would not prescribe singularly and particularly concerning external discipline and ceremonies, because He foresaw things to depend on the occasions and opportunities of times; nor did He think one form to accord with all ages; whereupon (says he) we must have recourse to the general rules, that all things may be tried by them. Finally, He delivered nothing in these points expressly, because they are not of necessity to salvation, but ought to be accommodated to the edification of the Church, according to the different disposition and custom of times and countries."

It becomes a question, then, to consider to whom are we to look for authority in these matters? "The Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies and authority in controversies of faith: and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's word written." The promise of Christ's presence is with the Church to the end of the world—not with the State. The State has another department, viz., "the use of the sword" [Rom. XIII. 4] to restrain evil doers: the good order and peace of the community are not to be disturbed by factious men.

The Church has power to expel disobedient members, just as much as any sect can act towards those who will not obey its rules; and, in either case, wherever there is toleration, the State ought to protect it in the discharge of duty. If the State gives countenance to one form of Christianity in preference to another, there is nothing to hinder it administering justice, even when devotedly given to the principles of the Church in union with the State. Toleration is one thing, and adopting erroneous principles is another. But when toleration is granted to any sect, it does not follow that that sect should be allowed to interfere with the doctrines and affairs of that Church, the members of which have influenced the State to grant it toleration and liberty

of conscience. Considerable difficulty has arisen, of late years, from the admission of so many into the House of Commons who deny, or are careless about, the main and essential doctrines and precepts of Christianity.

In matters affecting the ordinary taxes of the country little inconvenience may arise, but when these very persons, together with a number of sceptics and infidels, are allowed to legislate on matters affecting the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, it is time that something should be done to allow the Church unrestricted opportunity of settling its own difficulties on doctrinal and disciplinary matters. Dissenters have no right to object to this, since they can settle among themselves any disputes that may arise. What method would be best among Churchmen it is not the object of this work to offer an opinion. Whatever it may be, it is the duty of the State to afford that protection which all the various sects enjoy. This is of importance in a social, no less than religious point of view. The government, as well as the civil, and other institutions of our country should all teach one uniform lesson, and they will do so when they are all actuated by that Gracious Spirit, which is imparted through the instrumentality of the Church. When the spirit of Christianity pervades the public institutions of a country, it has a beneficial effect on the tone of feeling pervading all classes of society. Children are taught and trained to order and discipline at school, and when they grow up and come more in contact with the institutions of the country they are not without many useful lessons. If children notice others doing as they like, without restraint, it has a bad effect on their future career as men. In a neighbourhood where various sects of religion predominate, the children are apt to partake something of the spirit of independence and think there is no harm in people doing as they please; and each sect *is so anxious to keep up its numbers* that there is a continual yielding to the self-will, which often rises against the constituted authority. The Church of England, with the support of the State, tends to counteract such perverseness and insubordination; and how is it so? The people see that the two powers of Church and State are united in teaching the same lessons. They are not only instructed but trained also "to be subject unto the higher powers," under the assurance that "the powers that be are ordained of God."

When there is a training in the duties to superiors, and inferiors, whether in age or station of life, the good order of

society is maintained, we have more obedient children, more considerate parents, and subjects less troublesome to the civil magistrate. When people are trained, whether at home, or through sectarian teaching, or by the public institutions, to divest themselves of all reverence for anything connected with their moral and spiritual training, that spirit of independence arises which leads to irreverence towards everything that does not suit their fancy. If children are not trained to look up to others, in age and station superior to themselves, with becoming and submissive conduct, they very soon are apt to forget the God who is over all, with atheistical self-sufficiency. We cannot help noticing the ill-effects of the conduct of those injudicious people, who, with all their professed attachment to the Church of England, do more than her professed enemies towards depreciating the moral training and spiritual benefit which she affords.

I have already noticed, incidentally, from the canons of the Catholic Church, in its earliest ages, as well as from similar authoritative documents preserved in the Church of England, that when the Church and State co-operated, religion and literature flourished, while the State was in a more flourishing condition. Whenever the Church and State came into collision, the interference of a third party tended to augment dissensions, and put England in subjection to a foreign power.

The history of our country, from the earliest period to the present day, assures us that union is strength: it is so in religious, social, and political points of view. Beneficial results may be expected in all these respects.

If the State should cast off all support to the Episcopal form of Church government in this country, we must look for nothing but anarchy and confusion. If the Church of England is not to be allowed any longer to exercise its influence on the various classes of society, no existing sect has within itself the elements calculated to bind society together in unity, peace, and concord. The low, contracted tone of education and training, among so many of the religious sects which surround us, would never gain the influence and support of the country. Besides, the impression which so many diversities of creeds, intermingled with infidels and heretics, would have a bad effect on the moral tone of the population. The present constitution of Church and State secures an healthy, intellectual, and religious influence, from the lowest grade of our population to the highest stations. It is a too prevalent opinion that, because of some abuses

(which we may expect, to a certain amount, in a large and varied population), there ought necessarily to be a subversion of the whole of the existing form of representation and government. The expulsion of the bishops from the House of Lords has always been a favourite topic among those who know too well the healthful influence of Christian ministers when unrestrained in its exercise.

The abolition of the House of Lords itself (mischievous although such a measure would be) would be more reasonable, politically speaking, than the expulsion of the bishops from that House. What is the object of constitutional government, as opposed to despotism, but that the laws which are made may be such as the everyday wants of the population require? How are the wants of the people to be known except by representation? The House of Lords is not a representative body like the House of Commons. The security which the House of Lords gives to the Constitution, is of this nature, viz., that its members, not being dependent upon the surging tide of popular opinion, (frequently erroneous and ever-changing,) is often a breakwater till the storm is over. The members of the Lower House being dependent on the will of their constituents for their seats, are often obliged to pledge themselves to measures which their better judgment condemns. Such necessity, not being forced on the members of the Upper House, they are better able to exercise their judgment, when that judgment probably tells them that the outbreak of public opinion would be but temporary. On the other hand, not mixing with the mass of the people, their feelings can but imperfectly respond to those of the lower and middle classes. The education which most of them receive, at the public schools and universities, would qualify them to pass a sensible judgment, if they could but have an opportunity of mixing sufficiently with the classes in question. The bishops are, or ought to be, men who have done so. They have most of them served as curates, and thereby have been brought into direct contact with those classes which form the mass of the population. Any parish priest will know, that the poor do not hesitate to speak their mind to the clergyman, when they would hesitate to tell it to "my lord." The bishops having been most, if not all, parish priests, have received the same education which the nobility receive, and also that rough schooling which every curate has to go through. To take the bishops from the House of Lords, would deprive that House of the counsel

of men whose experience extends to that of all classes of the community.

Putting religious grounds aside, would it be wise to deprive the Upper House of such assistance? At present, are not their numbers in the House rather too few? Ought not their hands rather be strengthened, and that courage given to them which greater numbers alone can afford? If they would but bear in mind, that their position in the House of Lords is purely secular, and refuse to surrender the rights with which the Constitution has endowed Convocation, that position would demand the zealous support of every true Church of England man.

As temporalities are so much associated with the exercise of spiritual duties, the latter are apt to lie dormant, through consideration of the former. We have many canons in the early Catholic Church, discouraging inducements for removing from one See to another;* and steps were taken to prevent the bishops exercising their influence with the emperors, to have their Sees made metropolitan, through a change in State arrangements. In addition to those references to canons which are given in the note, there is one enacted at Sardica, A.D. 347, too plain to be omitted: "If any bishop remove from a lesser city to a greater, through covetousness and an affectation of power, it seems good to all the bishops, that such ought not to enjoy even lay-communion."

Several instances of removal from one See to another are on record, but then it was with the sanction of the provincial synod. Although the Council of Nice was stringent on that point it is clear they did not decidedly oppose the removal of bishops, as appear from the case of Eustathius, Bishop of Berœa, who was translated to Antioch by the decision of the Council of Nice. We have the authority of Sozomen, Lib. I. c. 2, where he says—"No one since Romanus had been appointed over the Church of Antioch on the Orontes, for the persecution, it appears, had prevented the ceremony of ordination from taking place. The bishops assembled at Nicæa were, however, so sensible of the purity of the life and doctrines of Eustathius that they adjudged him worthy to fill the Apostolic throne; he was then Bishop of Berœa, a place in the neighbourhood; they, therefore, translated him to Antioch." It may be observed, that the conduct of the Arian bishops called forth some stringent regulations at this period.

* Apostol. Canons, 11—14; Nice, 15; Antioch, 21.

Sometime later, at the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, there was a necessity to enforce similar regulations. The 12th Canon thus proceeds—"It is come to our knowledge that some, by making application to the (civil) power, have, by pragmatics, contrary to the ecclesiastical laws, divided one province into two, so that by this means there are two metropolitans in one province; therefore the holy synod has decreed that nothing of this sort be enterprised by any bishop for the future, for that he who undertakes it must be degraded from his dignity; and whatever cities have been already, by the letters of the emperor, dignified with the name of a metropolis, let them enjoy the title only; as likewise the bishop who administers the Church there, the just rights being preserved for the true metropolitan."

Covetousness and affectation of power have prevailed too much in all ages of the Church. When the increase of power and influence in ecclesiastical affairs is irrespective of the Church, and dependent on the external, there is great inducement on the part of bishops to suppress the voice of warning whenever those in State authority propound measures against the general welfare of the Church. If inducements of this nature should be obliterated, there would be greater freedom of speech whenever anti-Christian, uncharitable, and unconstitutional measures were brought forward.

If it should be thought no longer expedient to retain the presence of the bishops in the House of Lords, it is but justice to the Church of England that the true position of Convocation, provincial synods, as well as diocesan synods, should be recognized, and their decisions supported and enforced by the State, provided there is nothing against the common law of the country and the prerogative of the crown. When we consider that their ecclesiastical influence in Parliament has been so much reduced by the suppression of the mitred abbots, who were nearly, if not as many, as the bishops, and that there has been a vast accession of lay lords, it is no wonder that the influence of the bishops has decreased. It does not follow that lay lords are necessarily hostile to the influence of Christ's ministers; but it is too well known that, with the House of Lords, as well as the House of Commons, there is great facility for the admission of sectarians, who deny some of the leading articles of our faith, with a certain amount of scepticism and infidelity. Even sectarian preachers may be admitted into Parliament, while the clergy of the Church of England are excluded. We need not be surprised, then, if anti-Christian measures are at any

time forced on the Church, with scarcely a word of remonstrance.

The influence of those who have so much to do in regulating the temporalities of the Church is apt to prevail, and suppress the real opinion of the representatives of the Church. In the early days of Christianity there was a check on those who sought the influence of the emperor, that they might be made metropolitans or primates, and thus indulge a covetous and ambitious disposition. It is a very difficult matter to check the evil tendency of human nature; and to institute measures of that sort it would require careful consideration, lest other evils, equally as great, should arise. The union of Church and State appears, from past history and experience, to have extended a far more beneficial influence than ever was effected when there might be an interruption. Whenever ephemeral and self-constituted sects have gained an influence over the Legislature, the result has been confusion, disorder, tyranny, and irreverence. But when Church and State have at any time avoided interfering with each other, there has always been times of peace and national prosperity, and the aggressions of any foreign power are thereby more likely to be overcome. We belong to the Church Militant, and have been signed with the sign of the cross, in token that we should not be ashamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified, and manfully to fight under His banner against sin, the world, and the devil; but if insubordination arises among the soldiers of Christ, the enemy has an advantage; if they divide themselves into various independent parties, the enemy may overwhelm them; but if they adhere together—professing one faith, one Lord, one baptism, and keep in one body, the Church—they may expect the Divine blessing on their national efforts to promote the glory of God, and secure the peace, prosperity, and pre-eminence of the nation. These blessings are best obtained through the Communion of saints in the Holy Catholic Church, because by her the king and kingdom stand upon a solid foundation. “*Quoniam per eam Rex et regnum solidum subsistendi habent fundamentum.*” [Leges Eccl. S. Edw. R et Confess.]

By the same Author, 8vo., price 2s. 6d.,

Sermons on Various Subjects.

C O N T E N T S :

On the Responses.	Charity.
Trust in God.	Waiting on God.
The Nobleman's Son.	Sufficiency of Divine Grace.
Hope.	Harvest.

Also, 12mo.,

Sacrilegious Conduct.

A SERMON.

Price 2d.

Sold by JOHN H. BATTY, 2, Bedford Street, Strand.





